LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BT766 Copyright Dp.

Shelf. A4

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

TWENTY-EIGHT OBJECTIONS

AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF

DOUBLE-BIRTH PERFECTION

COMMONLY CALLED THE

"SECOND-WORK SANCTIFICATION."

TOGETHER WITH

A Clear Statement of the Bible Doctrine Concerning Christian Perfection.

ALSO A CONCLUDING CHAPTER CONTAINING

WORDS OF ADVICE TO YOUNG CHRISTIANS.

BY J. K. ALWOOD.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
No. 13,331 Ll.
1880.
CITY OF WASHINGTON

DAYTON, OHIO:
PUBLISHED FOR THE AUTHOR.
1880.

BT966
.A4

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1880,
By REV. J. K. ALWOOD.
In the office of the Librarlan of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

HLR 28 D42

PREFACE.

1. Satan can ruin souls only by means of deception. A knowledge of truth is the protection against deception. Next to the atonement made by the Redeemer of mankind, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, the system of God's revealed truth is the most precious object within the range of our contemplation. Our view of its preciousness is greatly heightened when we consider that without it the atonement and Spirit would avail us nothing. From this point of view their importance to us seems to be of the same grade. God proposes to save men by means of truth.

2. But truth is valueless to all who receive error in its stead. All truth is harmonious. When, therefore, an error is embraced, it renders the embrace of its opposite truth an impossibility. If that opposite truth be one of vital importance, then nothing can be more important than the displacement of its opposite error.

3. We find men of learning grasping opposite ideas on vital points. One or the other must be in error. No one truth contradicts any other truth. But great scholars diametrically contradict one another relative to the most important points in God's Bible. This raises the apprehension that it is not entirely safe to allow them to do our thinking and searching for us

on the subject of salvation; but, with all the help they can give us, we need to do some careful thinking for ourselves.

4. More than a quarter of a century ago I commenced the earnest perusal of the most approved authors on the subject of Bible holiness. I surrendered my judgment to those who advocated the highest attainment. I embraced the "second-work" theology without reserve. No other topic of theology has occupied so much of my attention as holiness. But the doctrine of the "second work," which should be called the doctrine of the "double moral birth" for the sake of perspicuity and of harmony with several expressions of its most eminent advocate, I was, by a careful study of God's word, compelled to abandon about fifteen years ago. Yet, distrustful of my own poor judgment on so exceedingly important a matter, I never allowed my lips to say, "I know the doctrine is an error," till about two years ago.

I then became thoroughly convinced, by the unsuccessful efforts of one of its ablest advocates, that the doctrine has no support in the Bible of God; that the teachings of this blessed book relative to holiness have been egregiously misunderstood by learned and pious men, and that an effort should be made to set forth both the error and the truth relative to this most important of all themes.

5. While it is true that there are many good things in many works on this subject, I know of none that I would be willing to place in the hands of my children as a safe guide and correct interpretation of the sacred word on the subject of sanctification.

THE DOCTRINE

here controverted may be clearly stated in five propositions, thus:

(1.) Regeneration does not make the heart pure, but leaves it full of moral pollution.

(2.) Purification does not occur at the time of regeneration.

(3.) Purification is a work separate and distinct from regeneration, and subsequent to it.

(4.) A second effort at moral cleansing by the power of the Holy Ghost subsequent to regeneration is an indispensable prerequisite to complete moral purity.

(5.) A man may be a Christian, and yet be "FULL OF SIN" at the same time.

6. The authors herein regarded as the principal champions of the doctrine are Rev. Mr. Wesley, Prof. Thomas C. Upham, Bishop Nicholas Castle, Dr. J. A. Wood, Jacob Hoke, Esq., President Asa Mahan, Dr. Jesse T. Peck, Dr. Daniel Steele, Mrs. Hester Anne Rogers, and Mrs. Phebe Palmer.

Dr. Adam Clarke is largely quoted because he is claimed by their latest authors, and quoted as a supporter of their views. I quote him as being acceptable on all sides. No opposer of the doctrine is quoted in this volume.

7. I have endeavored to bring every feature and phase of the doctrine face to face with God's Bible, which is the standard and only safe guide in the way to the better land.

8. All the scriptures claimed by these theologians have been prayerfully and carefully examined, and shown to give no testimony in favor of their doctrine. Twenty passages only have

been selected out of the many which testify directly against it. This is three more than they all have claimed on their side.

9. I have endeavored to make the work intelligible and interesting to the plowman, and not distasteful to the scholar. Yet I have been a little more careful of the former than of the latter, in view of his greater needs. I should rather endure criticisms on style from the critical than the accusation of "INCOMPREHENSIBILITY," from men of plain sense. I would rather sacrifice for explicit correctness than for euphony.

10. It is but just to say that these pages have been written piecemeal amid the toils of a traveling preacher, delivering from four to six discourses a week to congregations in Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana. The toil has been too great to make this work what it should be. Yet these have been hours of the deepest joy and sweetest communion with the Holy One, the infinite source of light, life, and joy, in whom there is no variableness nor shadow of turning, and to whom this humble work is hereby solemnly dedicated, with the prayer and hope that it may prove to many a means of a better understanding of the great salvation purchased by the blood of the Lamb. To this end I humbly ask the earnest prayer of every Christian heart.

MORENCI, MICHIGAN, June 15, 1880.

CONTENTS.

1. PREFACE. 2. CONTENTS. 3. PHRASES. 4. TWENTY-EIGHT OBJECTIONS.

PAGE.

OBJECTION 1.—It introduces and gives currency to the idea of caste in Christanity..... 17

OBJECTION 2.—It assumes and teaches that God does the work of redemption by halves..... 20

OBJECTION 3.—It assumes a deficiency in the blood of Christ..... 21

OBJECTION 4.—It assumes that God justifies sin..... 22

OBJECTION 5.—It assumes that God dwells in an unholy temple..... 24

OBJECTION 6.—It assumes that a soul full of sin can have peace with God..... 25

OBJECTION 7.—The doctrine assumes and teaches that a half Christian, full of moral corruption, is on the way to heaven..... 26

OBJECTION 8.—It lowers the standard of piety, and so encourages sin..... 27

OBJECTION 9.—It attributes changeability and duplicity to God..... 30

OBJECTION 10.—The doctrine assumes that God can and does beget and become the parent of sin..... 33

PAGE.

OBJECTION 11.—It teaches that the life of God and the death of sin are compatible..... 34

OBJECTION 12.—It teaches that a heart full of sin can delight in the law of the Lord..... 36

OBJECTION 13.—It assumes that God and Satan can and often do dwell together in the same heart..... 45

OBJECTION 14.—It teaches that there is moral pollution in the image of God..... 47

OBJECTION 15.—It teaches that God justifies souls and fills them with peace while in the neglect of duty and in violation of his righteous law..... 50

OBJECTION 16.—It teaches that God approves and loves hearts that are full of hatred against his person, and of elements that tend toward the subversion of his government..... 52

OBJECTION 17.—It brings perplexity, confusion, doubtings, and often backslidings into the minds of Christians..... 55

OBJECTION 18.—It leads to self-righteousness and self-conceit..... 59

OBJECTION 19.—It leads to fanaticism..... 61

OBJECTION 20.—It divides Christians..... 66

OBJECTION 21.—It leads to the absurdity that moral qualities are individual, personal entities..... 69

OBJECTION 22.—It misrepresents the testimony of the Holy Spirit..... 73

OBJECTION 23.—The doctrine is a child of contradictions. 81

1. On the definitive title, DOUBLE MORAL BIRTH..... 81
2. On consecration..... 85
3. On the dominion of sin over the justified soul..... 93

PAGE.

4. On obtaining Christ without obtaining full salvation..... 118

5. On purification, instantaneous or gradual..... 137

6. On the nature of the change wrought in santification..... 155

7. On the conditionality or fatality of full salvation. 165

OBJECTION 24.—It has no support in the Scriptures, where its friends pretend to find it..... 178

1. Scripture—Rom. 7: 14–25..... 178

2. Scripture—Heb. 6: 1–3..... 197

3. Scripture—Eph. 5: 25–27..... 205

4. Scripture—Gal. 5: 17..... 211

5. Scripture—James 4: 5, 6..... 215

6. Scripture—Luke 8: 14..... 221

7. Scripture—I. John 2: 16..... 224

8. Scripture—John 15: 2, 3..... 226

9. Scripture—Matt. 19: 14 229

10. Scripture—I. Thess. 5: 23..... 238

11. Scripture—John 17: 17..... 243

12. Scripture—Rom. 12: 1, 2..... 252

13. Scripture—I. Cor. 3: 1–3..... 354

14. Scripture—II. Cor. 7: 1..... 260

15. Scripture—I. Peter 1: 16..... 263

OBJECTION 25 —The sacred Scriptures are directly against it..... 267

Scripture 1—James 2: 10..... 267

Scripture 2—I. Cor. 12: 13..... 272

PAGE.

Scripture 3—Rom. 8: 9..... 273

Scripture 4—Gal. 2: 20..... 274

Scripture 5—John 8: 36..... 276

Scripture 6—Rom. 8: 17..... 278

Scripture 7—I. John 4: 12..... 281

Scripture 8—I. John 1: 5–7..... 283

Scripture 9—I. John 3: 7, 8..... 293

Scripture 10—Gal. 5: 24..... 298

Scripture 11—II. Cor. 5: 17..... 301

Scripture 12—Rom. 13: 8, 10..... 309

Scripture 13—I. John 2: 4, 5..... 311

Scripture 14—Acts 15: 8, 9..... 312

Scripture 15—I. John 2: 10..... 318

Scripture 16—I. Cor. 3: 16, 17..... 320

Scripture 17—Luke 14: 26, 33..... 322

Scripture 18—Eph. 1: 7..... 329

Scripture 19—I. Cor. 13: 1, 3, 13..... 332

Scripture 20—Matt. 7: 18..... 337

OBJECTION 26.—Its votaries hurtfully ignore the soul's liability to backslide, and the nature and imperceptibility of the backsliding process..... 339

Backsliding—the possibility—facts—fallen angels—fallen men—Adam, Saul, Solomon, Peter—the church at Ephesus—Mr. Wesley's concessions and surrender..... 343

OBJECTION 27.—The double-birth doctrine needs support from sophistry..... 363

PAGE.

1. Prof. Thomas C. Upham's sophistry on growth in holiness..... 364

2. President Asa Mahan's mistake on partial faith..... 367

3. A sophistry built on the Bible doctrine of holiness —"holiness people—holiness meetings"..... 371

OBJECTION 23.—The double-birth theology perverts the Bible doctrine of growth in grace, and confuses the mind in relation to it..... 376

Bible doctrine of growth in grace..... 376

1. Growth in knowledge..... 383

2. In faith..... 387

3. In strength..... 396

4. In Watchfulness..... 398

5. In the habit of prayer,..... 400

6. In the admiration of God's character..... 400

7. In firmness..... 402

8. In usefulness..... 402

The triune firm—the decreed mode of endless bliss... 407

9. Growth in the habit of restraining the physical appetite..... 407

10. Growth in amiability—usefulness..... 409

CONCLUDING CHAPTER—Words of advice..... 413

1. Keep all on the altar..... 414

2. Guard against love of the world..... 416

3. Seek perpetual delights from God..... 418

4. Constantly regard God as a present, personal associate..... 424

PAGE

5. "Bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" 426

6. "Have always a conscience void of offense toward God and men"..... 429

7. "Pray without ceasing"..... 434

PHRASES.

The phrases by which the supposed corruption of the soul after regeneration and prior to sanctification is designated by the double-birth theologians are as follows: "Depravity, inbred sin, inbred corruption, inbred pollution, the old man, the carnal mind, the flesh, the evil root, the roots of bitterness, the body of sin, inherent sin, impurity, principle of evil, the seed of all sin, unrighteousness, unholy nature, unsanctified nature."

Persons who have been born again, but never professed the blessing of sanctification as a separate and distinct additional work of the Spirit in their hearts, are by these theologians called the "merely justified, merely regenerate, unsanctified Christians the justified, the regenerate," &c.

TWENTY-EIGHT OBJECTIONS

AGAINST THE

Doctrine of Double-Birth Perfection.

OBJECTION 1.

IT INTRODUCES AND GIVES CURRENCY TO THE IDEA OF CASTE IN CHRISTIANITY.

It does not go so far as paganism in India, dividing society into *many* castes; but it adopts the same principle by dividing God's family into two orders, the saved and the half-saved, the pure and the polluted, the whole children and the half children, whole Christians and half Christians. One of their best writers characterizes the "merely justified" as "half Christians and half sinners." They have not all had the frankness to express their views in such terms. The expression is a lucid exposition of absurdity, and is therefore carefully suppressed by nearly all of their writers. But if the doctrine were true, the phrase would be a correct one; for a pure-hearted person is very

different from one who is "full of inbred sin." If the pure one is not something more than a Christian, surely the one who is full of corruption can not be more than half a Christian. Can any one be more than a Christian? Can he be better than God's law requires all men to be? Can he be purer than the blood of the Lamb can make him? Surely not. Men are only Christians when they are what Christ's great salvation can make them—nothing more, nothing less. Rest is found only in Jesus' bosom; and the rest found there is perfect rest. No other kind is found there. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee." (Isa. 26: 3.) His law requires all and no more than he gives to all who "fly for refuge to his breast."

How can we believe that there are two grades of children in God's family, when we hear him saying, "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Bishop N. Castle, one of the most vigorous and zealous advocates of the double-birth theology, says, "Whatever else may be meant, we are most certainly safe in affirming that God's spiritual kingdom—his invisible church, this mystic body of Christ—is included in this phrase, 'The kingdom of heaven.' This kingdom is called 'the church,' which is the body of Christ, himself being the head. * * * It is

called the 'general assembly, and church of the first-born which are written in heaven. * * * It is called a family, and embraces the redeemed of every age and clime, and also those already in heaven." (*Religious Telescope*, October 22, 1879. Moral Status of Infants.)

God's spiritual kingdom is a unit. His spiritual family is a unit. Part is in heaven, part on earth; yet it is all one family. God has no upper and lower grades in his family with respect to moral character. Some angels are mightier than others; but they are all pure—all alike in moral character. They are all his children. None are half children. There is no aristocracy nor yeomanry in God's family. They are all children of a King. They are all of royal blood. They are all God's nobility. They are all enrolled in the "Lamb's book of life." The name of the weakest child of God is on the same roll with the names of Abraham, Moses, Elijah, and Gabriel. The infant member of a family is just as precious and just as purely a member, a *whole* member, with its twenty-four hours' history, as its oldest brother with a history five thousand times as long. And how keen would be the reproach and insult to the family, should any one insinuate that the little stranger is only half a member. How much greater the reproach and the insult to God's family and to the

Father of that family, to teach that the very young members are not whole members; that they are a mongrel order in the heavenly family, partly of God and partly of Satan? The slander is grievous, indeed.

OBJECTION 2.

IT ASSUMES AND TEACHES THAT GOD DOES THE WORK OF REDEMPTION BY HALVES.

The work of redemption is a prodigious miracle. It may well be regarded as a greater work than the creation of worlds. These will perish and be no more, but the immortal soul will never die. It will live in bliss or in woe while the cycles of ages continue their endless course.

In the physical realm of God's universe, among ephemeral creatures, the Infinite has permitted hybrids. But everything is complete in its order. Jesus, the great physician of soul and body, never sent a leper, a lame, a palsied, or a blind man away half cured. Nor did ever a possessed man depart to his home bearing the tidings of a devil or a legion of devils half expelled and half possessing their tormented victim. When the incarnate King of Glory said to a disease, a devil, or a legion of devils, "Come out of the man," his resistless fiat settled all disputes about the tenure of position.

Prompt obedience was inevitable. None went from Jesus under instruction to return for a second effort to complete their cure. He made them "every whit whole.'

But these theologians tell us that this same King of Glory, this almighty Physician, does the most important of all his works in incomplete halves. Of course this is a baseless, beggarly assumption, wholly without foundation, as we shall see. It is a disgraceful slander on Jesus as a physician of souls. It says, To one soul he is a whole Savior, to another he is a half Savior. Half saved is not saved. Then the regenerate soul is no more saved—according to this "second-work" theology—than Satan himself.

OBJECTION 3.

IT ASSUMES A DEFICIENCY IN THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.

The sacred word attributes the salvation of man to the efficacy of Jesus' blood. It is agreed on all hands that this efficacy is applied to the soul at the moment of regeneration. This is done, of course, on the condition of entire surrender and unreserved trust on the part of the soul. This is the highest condition the soul can ever meet. When this is met the efficacy of the blood of the Lamb is instantaneously applied by the Holy

Ghost; as Paul declares, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." (Titus 3: 5–7.) Here is a *washing*,—the "washing of regeneration,"—which is by the same author and by John called a baptism. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (I. Cor. 12: 13.) "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Luke 3: 16.) Both fire and water are employed as emblems of the purifying efficacy of Jesus' blood in regeneration; and John, in his first epistle, 1: 7, 9, declares, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin,—all unrighteousness." And yet the theologians under review have the temerity to tell us that that precious blood does not, at its first application, make a complete cleansing, but leaves the soul full of "corruption." Of course the honest reader sees that they contradict God's holy word. Hence they are in error.

OBJECTION 4.

IT ASSUMES THAT GOD JUSTIFIES SIN.

The "second-work" theology tells us that the "merely justified" soul—that is, the regenerate, for it is never denied by any of them that the soul is invariably regenerated at the same moment when it is justified—is "full of sin." Dr. J. A. Wood, in his very pretentious and among "second-work" people very popular work, entitled, "Perfect Love," quoting John Wesley, the theological father of them all, says, "If there be no such second change, if there be no instantaneous deliverance after justification, then we must be content, as well as we can, to remain full of sin till death." (Page 60.) Of course, God pronounces a soul just when he justifies it. To justify is to forgive and pronounce just. Sin is, by these theologians, said to be the soul's moral condition and nature, in the case of the justified. Then the doctrine regards God as pronouncing the sinful nature and condition of the soul just; for he can not regard the soul as just unless he so regard its moral condition and nature. It is a vile slander on God to say that he pronounces a soul just when it is full of sin; for it is precisely equivalent to saying that he pronounces sin just. It is to say that God has no regard for moral distinctions. This is to say

that he delights as much in moral turpitude as in moral beauty. This may be said of Satan and bad men, but not without slander of "the King in his beauty."

OBJECTION 5.

IT ASSUMES THAT GOD DWELLS IN AN UNHOLY TEMPLE.

It is agreed on all hands that the Holy One takes up his abode in the soul at the moment of conversion; for as we have seen,—I. Cor. 12: 13; Titus 3: 5–7,—he is the converting agent—"he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. 3: 20.) "Abide in me, and I in you," says the same condescending King of Glory. (John 15: 4.) "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." (Rom. 5: 5.) Thus it is clear that God dwells in the hearts of all his children from the moment of their conversion. But the "second-work" doctrine says, as we have seen from Wood after Wesley, "They are full of sin." Now Paul declares, "the temple of God is holy." (I. Cor. 3: 17.) Double-birth theology declares Paul in error. Whom shall we

believe, Paul or these modern theologians? Let us cling to Paul yet a little while.

OBJECTION 6.

IT TEACHES THAT A SOUL FULL OF SIN CAN HAVE PEACE WITH GOD.

Paul says, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5: 1.) Isaiah calls it "perfect peace." "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee." (Isa. 26: 3.) Thus it appears that all who trust in God have perfect peace *because* they trust in him. Trust is active faith. Justification comes to the soul on account of its act of trust in the Redeemer. This justification brings perfect peace. But double-birth theology declares, "The merely justified are full of sin; and if they do not get the second work they must be content as well as they can to remain full of sin till death." Thus they have the sinful soul enjoying God's perfect peace. But Isaiah declares "there is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (Isa. 57: 21.) Thus we see this double-birth doctrine in collision with the eternal word again. Shall we give up that word? Not yet.

OBJECTION 7.

THE DOUBLE-BIRTH THEOLOGY ASSUMES AND TEACHES THAT A HALF CHRISTIAN FULL OF SIN IS ON HIS WAY TO HEAVEN.

In a letter dated "Philomath, Oregon, January 22, 1878," Bishop N. Castle said, "Compare Romans 7: 25, where man is half sinner and half Christian." They all tell us there must be a "second change, an instantaneous deliverance after justification, or it must remain full of sin." Dr. Wesley says the regenerate soul is full of "the hidden abominations, the depth of pride, self-will, and hell; yet having the witness in themselves, 'thou art an heir of God, a joint-heir with Christ.'" ("*Plain Account of Christian Perfection.*" Page 10.) Thus we have, by the highest authority among these theologians of the mixed theology, the half Christian full of sin. Now let us see about his being on the way to heaven.

We see that Wesley agrees with Paul in recognizing every regenerate soul as "an heir of God, a joint-heir with Christ." Paul says, "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." (Rom. 8: 17.) So then we have the half Christian full of sin in possession of a good title to heaven. Now, is he on the way to that better land?

Bishop Castle, in his elaborate answer to the question, "Can a man be half Christian and half sinner at the same time?" in *Religious Telescope* of June 26, 1878, says, "A sister once said to me, 'I do not profess sanctification. If I were to die, would I be saved?' 'Certainly,' I said, 'if you maintain your justification.'" Dr. Wesley teaches precisely the same doctrine, as we shall see from his own pen on a future page. Meanwhile let us seriously consider this matter of a soul "full of the hidden abominations, pride, self-will, and hell," traveling on the way concerning which Isaiah declares, "the unclean shall not pass over it." (Isa. 35: 8.)

OBJECTION 8.

IT LOWERS THE STANDARD OF PIETY, AND SO ENCOURAGES SIN.

Any theory or system of theology which leads a soul to the conclusion that it can be on the way to heaven while full of sin must necessarily neutralize the effect of the most powerful incentive to moral purity; namely, the desire to reach heaven. We have just now seen that this mixed theology teaches that the soul can be full of sin and on its way to heaven at the same time,—full of "pride, self-will, and hell, yet having the wit-

ness, 'Thou art an heir of God, a joint-heir with Christ.'"

"Bishop Castle says: "Is there no seeking of fleshly gratification, no sensual and impure desires, no love of parade, gaudy dress, and costly decoration among Christian people; no seeking of honorable distinctions and loud boastings of office and position among Christian men, and even ministers of the word? Whence do these come but from the impurity that yet reigns within? Indeed, this is so apparent that to pause for reasoning upon it is but to contradict a judgment that has ripened into unquestioned certainty." (*Ans. ques.* 4, *Tel. June* 19*th*, 1878.)

In the same article this same author, commenting on I. Cor. 3: 1–3, says: "The question, 'Are ye not carnal, and walk as men?' may well be asked of many modern Christians, in view of the disaffection that exists upon the part of one toward another. It will hardly do to say that they were not in a state of grace; for they are written to as being in the relation of babes in Christ. In Christ, and yet carnal! Could they be holy while in this condition? One charge made against them most clearly indicates a soul-condition that does not comport with entire sanctification. They had envying among them. The apostle would say that they were sinful in thought, in word, and in deed."

And yet the bishop would have us believe they were Christians. Here, then, we have the bishop's model of a lower-grade Christian. "He is envious, boastful, proud, and sensual; sinful in thought, in word, and in deed." Yet he has a title to heaven, and is on his way thither. If he dies in this condition he will surely reach that evergreen shore.

Prof. T. C. Upham chimes in on the same strain of mixed theology. In his "Interior Life," pages 28 and 29, he says: "It is a great complaint in the Christian church at the present day that there is a want of faith. If we may take the statements of Christians themselves, they do not *believe;* certainly not as they should do. And why is it? It is because they have not fully consecrated themselves to God. In other words, they continue to indulge in some known sins."

Thus we see from the testimony of three of its most eminent and able authors that this double-birth doctrine justifies sin in some of its most hateful forms. How much does it lack of a full indorsement of all sin, in every form? Not much. All sin is rebellion against God. They tell us he justifies the soul in rebellion.

Now this justification of sin in the Christian pulpit, this declaration from Christian theologians but a man may be proud, ambitious, boastful,

sensual, envious, and full of sin and hell, and yet at the same time a Christian on his way to heaven, is, as it seems to me, the best-paying arrangement Satan is able to run. By means of it he lowers the standard of piety, and ruins souls by the million. Such a doctrine is not of God, and will be rejected by good men "when the mists have passed away."

OBJECTION 9.

IT ATTRIBUTES CHANGEABILTY AND DUPLICITY TO GOD.

It does this by teaching that God at one time refuses to do for a soul what at a later period he will do for the same soul on the same conditions. Faith in God is admitted on all hands to be the one only condition on which he justifies and on which he sanctifies. None claim works as a condition of justification or of sanctification. "For our heart shall rejoice in him, because we have trusted in his holy name." (Ps. 33: 21.) "He shall deliver them from the wicked, and save them, because they trust in him." (Ps. 37: 40.) "By grace are ye saved through faith." (Eph. 2: 8.) "Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness." (Rom. 4: 3, 9.)

Dr. J. A. Wood says: "What is the only and

the proximate condition of sanctification? *Faith.* 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' Faith is the only condition of sanctification; and God always saves the moment true faith is exercised." (*Per. Love, page* 80.)

Prof. Upham teaches precisely the same doctrine throughout the thirteen hundred pages of his "Interior Life, Life of Faith, and Divine Union." John Wesley teaches the same in all his works.

They all teach, also, that the soul must exercise full, implicit, perfect faith in order to obtain justification; that he must make a complete, unreserved surrender of himself to God before he can be justified. In a letter before me, dated February 2, 1880, Dr. Wood says, "No one is justified on partial faith."

In a letter before me, dated Chambersburg, January 31, 1880, Mr. J. Hoke, author of several works on holiness, says: "In regard to the question, 'Can a soul **ob**tain pardon—justification—on partial faith?' I answer, No. Faith, in every case, must be full and perfect, or it is not faith at all."

Dr. Daniel Steele, an author in high repute among the "second-work" people, in a letter before me, dated Salem, Mass., February 21, 1880, says: "I do not know what partial faith is. The penitent who has faith enough in Christ to trust

in him, and him only, will be pardoned. The soul that consciously withholds anything from God can not exercise saving faith."

Dr. Wesley says: "The voice of God to your soul is, Believe and be saved. Faith is the condition, and the only condition of sanctification, exactly as it is in justification. No man is sanctified till he believes; every man when he believes." (*P. L., page* 81.)

Now I ask, in the name of common sense, and in the name of an honest God, "in whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning," if the penitent must trust all in the hands of God and believe with a perfect and unreserved faith, and if "faith is the condition of sanctification, just as it is of justification," and if "every man is sanctified when he believes," how dare any man of ordinary sense and honesty say the soul is not sanctified when it exercises full faith in the Redeemer, and thereby obtains "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost?" How can God, without duplicity, offer salvation to a soul on the condition of unreserved trust, and bestow only *half* of salvation when that soul meets the condition by trusting all in his hands? God offers salvation on condition of trust. So says the Bible. So say these theologians. Yet the theologians tell us only the first half of sal-

vation will be bestowed on compliance with the condition. The other half will not come now, but after a length of time—perhaps not till death.

Though you comply with the condition on which God offers salvation, yet it may not "please our Lord to speak the word, Be clean; and you must content yourself as best you can to remain full of sin till death." (*Wood after Wesley.*) (P. L., page 60.)

Shame on such bold, brazen-faced, slanderous theology, impeaching the veracity and sincerity of God. We shall see on future pages that the scriptures it claims for support scorn its effrontery.

OBJECTION 10.

THE DOCTRINE ASSUMES THAT GOD BECOMES THE PARENT OF SIN WHENEVER A SOUL IS BORN AGAIN.

It claims that the soul is full of sin immediately after regeneration, and prior to all backsliding. It claims that the soul can never be free from sin prior to a second change, another birth, "of a different kind, and infinitely greater than any before," &c. (*Wesley in C. P., page* 23.) They tell us that the regenerated soul is "full of sin, the hidden abominations, pride, self-will, and hell."

Now, any man of common sense knows that in

regeneration the soul is born of God. John's testimony on this point can not be misunderstood by the honest reader. He says of Jesus, "He came to his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John 1: 11–13.)

If a soul is born of God he becomes, at the moment of regeneration, the parent of that soul, and so the parent of its moral nature, character, and condition. If now it possesses a polluted, sinful moral nature, as these theologians tell us it does, then God is the parent of that polluted, sinful nature. The conclusion is inevitable on the premise they thrust into our hands. The logic of this blasphemous doctrine gives "sin in believers" a divine origin, and impeaches the holiness of God by declaring him to be the parent of an unholy moral nature. We shall see how severely the Scriptures are against it, if the Lord permit and help.

OBJECTION 11.

IT TEACHES THAT THE LIFE OF GOD AND THE DEATH OF SIN ARE COMPATIBLE.

Jesus said, "I am the resurrection and the life."

(John 11 : 25.) "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." (John 6 : 35.) "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." (I. John 5 : 11, 12.)

It is agreed on all hands that Christ dwells in the heart of every regenerated person. He comes in and imparts the eternal life of the holy One. This fact is placed beyond all reasonable doubt by the texts just quoted. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." (I. John 4: 15.) This forever settles the question. The living God dwells in all his children.

But the double-birth theology tells us that prior to the "second change,"—the second part of the double birth,—the soul is still full of the carnal mind. Paul declares that "to be carnally-minded is death." (Rom. 8: 6.)

Here, then, we have the eternal life of God and the carnal death of sin dwelling together in the same soul. Life and death are wedded and dwelling in the nature and texture of the same immortal spirit. He who can believe such a theology can, by a little effort, believe whatever he decides to believe. Let us prayerfully cling to the blessed Bible, and reject such absurdities.

OBJECTION 12.

IT TEACHES THAT A HEART FULL OF SIN CAN DELIGHT IN THE LAW OF GOD.

It is a fact so explicitly declared in the sacred word that the regenerate soul delights in God's law that scarcely any one in christendom would risk his reputation on a denial of the fact. Israel's sweet singer declares, "His delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." (Ps. 1: 2.) "O how love I thy law." (Ps. 119: 97.)

1. It must be conceded by all, and is denied by none, that obedience to God's law must accompany a profession of heirship to render it consistent, and that mere mechanical obedience, without affectionate *heart* obedience, is of no value in the sight of God. He "looketh on the heart."

2. Under the stern necessity of recognizing these truths, Dr. Wesley, even in his sermon on "sin in believers," makes the unavoidable concession concerning the regenerate soul, that "he keepeth the commandments of God, and doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight, so exercising himself as to 'have a conscience void of offense' toward God and toward man; and he hath power both over outward and inward sin,

even from the moment he is justified." (Wesley's Sermons, Vol. I., page 109.)

But on the precise contrary of all this Dr. Wesley informs us, as we have already several times noticed, that the heart of the regenerate man, prior to the "second work," is "full of sin the hidden abominations, the depths of pride, self-will, and hell." Thus our 12th objection is seen to rest on truth. It is an idea that the votaries of the doctrine are perpetually bringing forward in the rehearsal of their experience.

Let us take a glance at the experience of the pious Bishop N. Castle, as given by his own pen, with our eye on the point in our proposition. It has been published by a "holiness association," with the intention of presenting a view of the regenerate heart before obtaining the "second work," the manner of obtaining that work, as they view the matter, and the experience after. We have not room for the entire tract. The bishop says, "I have been in the ministry eighteen years. To me this period of my life has been one of great dissatisfaction in more respects than one; principally, however, on account of want of more spiritual power and real pleasure in my work. I was driven during this period into many an unhappy strait; tossed on many a rough sea; well-nigh stranded by times on some fatal shoal; swept by

gales of glory at one time, until I seemed like the disciples on the mount of transfiguration, and then, at another time, plunged into the shades of the most excessive gloom, where all seemed well-nigh lost. With this strange variegation—this moral medley—in my life I spent many of these years. * * I found an unsteadiness and unevenness in my life that by times gave me great concern. Not that I did not have during this period a hope of future well-being; but I seemed often to be wanting in that faith that gives, *at the present*, 'the substance of the things hoped for.' My faith seemed more a creature of emotion than an agent of life,—more the *effect* than the *cause* of feeling,—so that when I had strong and deep feeling, then I had, as I thought, an abiding faith. Just the converse of this was true under a reverse of feeling. I found many things *in* me that were averse to my profession. * * I found my besetments hard to lay aside. The motions of sin in me led me to feel as one of old exclaimed, 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' I felt that in a certain sense I had been crucified with Christ; but still the *body* of this death seemed yet to cling to me. The form of that old life incumbered, and sometimes enslaved me. In this condition I sighed for release. I wanted freedom from that

warring law that was in my members, by which I was so often brought into captivity to the law of sin. I delighted, all this time, in the law of God after the inward man; but, notwithstanding this, I felt myself carnal, sold under sin; for that which I allowed not, that I did; and what I would *do*, that I did not."

After seeking for a time, Mr. Castle found what he calls peace. He says, "My heart was filled with overflowing peace. *Peace;* yes, that is the word. Not another word aside from that kindred one, *love*, in our language, so fully expresses this state of grace."

Well, this is precisely what the soul obtains in the first moment of conversion. Paul says, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through onr Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5 : 1.) Peace; yes, that is what the justified soul obtains and enjoys while he enjoys justification, and on the same condition on which it was obtained. Isaiah calls it "*perfect* peace," and places it on the same condition. He says, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee." (Isa. 26 : 3.)

It appears from the bishop's own testimony that during his mixed experience he was "often wanting in that faith that gives, *at the present*, the *substance* of things hoped for." He did not exer-

cise at all times that faith that brings the "perfect peace" enjoyed by every justified soul, according to Paul's view of the subject. Had he constantly trusted all in the hands of his God, just as when he was converted, he would have constantly enjoyed that perfect peace. A faith that brings no blessing "*at the present*" never will bring a blessing. A faith which relates only to the future brings no salvation. This is apparent from the very nature of the case.

When the bishop's faith failed, his love necessarily failed. He, like the church at Ephesus, "had left his first love," and needed to "repent and do the first works;" for "he that believeth not is condemned already." "He that doubteth is condemned." He that is condemned is not justified.

If he had constantly trusted in God he would not have "found many things in him that were averse to his profession." God would have kept him in that perfect peace which he found after the awful struggle. God keeps all in perfect peace who trust in him. He says, "I found many things in me which were averse to my profession." He professed to be a Christian. Then, according to his statement, there were in him many things which were contrary to the Christian character. And this fact clearly appears from other statements, as we shall see.

But in his answer to the question, "Can a man be half Christian and half sinner at the same time?" he says, "All regenerate persons are clearly Christians, and will so remain as long as they maintain their justification. When that is lost they cease to be Christians." (*Tel.*, *June* 26, 1878.) This is doubtless true; but how can a man retain his justification when he "finds in him many things averse to the Christian character?" It is simply impossible. Whenever a soul recognizes in itself things which are contrary to its own standard of excellency,—and especially if contrary to its own profession,—it can not possibly avoid self-condemnation. And it can not rest a moment under self-condemnation without the condemnation of the Almighty; for "if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things." Whenever conscience condemns the soul it is because the soul has made a choice or decision believed to be wrong, and so placed itself in the attitude of indorsing the wrong. This is a wrong attitude for the soul; and the soul's conscience and the Maker of that conscience precisely harmonize in condemning it for such an attitude. Condemnation from God is therefore necessarily consequent upon self-condemnation. The bishop, therefore, could not stand justified before God when he saw in himself things contrary to his

profession. Yet he wishes us to believe that his case is a true picture of the unsanctified Christian.

Here is the point at which multitudes are ruined. They fancy that God overlooks the foibles of their self-indulgences, which they can not fully approve themselves. They endure the self-condemnation until they become accustomed to it, and conscience grows dull. The sweets of the first love quietly subside. "The rivers of pleasure" slowly dry up. The leaden streams of dull formalism slowly, sluggishly flow on. An occasional freshet raises a ripple; but it soon subsides. Faith rests in a bogus, home-made god, who overlooks the accumulating impurity and growing habit of religious sluggishness. The God whose eyes are as lamps of fire, and who hates the very shadow of impurity, is exchanged for the more indulgent one, and quite forgotten. All such hearts will some day be alarmed by the following clap of thunder: "*Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts.*" (I. Peter 3: 15.) God is holy. As such he will reign in the heart, or he will not speak peace there. Men may speak peace to themselves, and be fanned into a slumbering peace by a soft theology on the lips of hirelings, when God has not spoken peace. But God will never speak peace in an impure heart. "They have healed the hurt

of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace." (Jer. 8: 11.)

The bishop says: "The form of that old life incumbered, and sometimes enslaved me. * * * I was often brought into captivity to the law of sin."

How can these statements be harmonized with the following? "I delighted, all this time, in the law of God after the inward man."

Then, further on, he says, "But notwithstand-this, I felt myself carnal, sold under sin."

Here are statements utterly irreconcilable with one another and with God's word. A captive enslaved by his sinful carnality, delighting all this time in the law of God! There can be no such case. Paul settles this question with a solitary declaration, "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8: 7.) When the bishop was "carnal, sold under sin, enslaved, and in captivity to the law of sin and death," as he declares he was, he was surely mistaken in the opinion that he "delighted all this time in the law of God." Paul declares it an impossibility for the carnal mind to delight in the law of God.

The bishop has doubtless related his experience conscientiously, just as we have heard others re-

lating similar experiences in a similar way. But he certainly had not a correct understanding of his own heart at all times, or else—dare we utter the thought?—Paul had not a correct understanding of the moral *status* of the carnal mind and its relation to the law of God. When the bishop was "carnal, sold under sin," and "plunged into the shades of the most excessive gloom," he was most certainly in a backslidden condition, if he had ever been converted—of which there can be no reasonable doubt; for Paul declares that the "justified soul rejoices in hope." And there can be no rejoicing in the heart which is "plunged into the shades of the most excessive gloom." John says, "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." (I. John 1 : 5, 6.) Surely all Christians have fellowship with God; for he dwells in their hearts. But "if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness [or "plunge into the most excessive gloom"], we lie. Such is John's view of the subject. But he and Paul seem to have an entirely different view of the whole subject from that of the bishop. While the bishop thinks the Corinthians "were sinful in thought, in word, and in deed," and were yet all children of God, John thinks and declares that

"he that committeth sin is of the devil;" and, "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin. * * * He can not sin, because he is born of God." (I. John 3: 8, 9.)

OBJECTION 13.

IT ASSUMES THAT GOD AND SATAN CAN, AND OFTEN DO, DWELL IN THE SAME HEART.

We have already repeatedly seen that the Holy One takes up his abode in the heart at the moment of conversion. (See Acts 10: 44; Rev. 3: 20; Rom. 5: 5; I. Cor. 3: 16; 12, 13; John 6; 47, 48; I. John 5: 6, 10.)

We know that, as Dr. Wesley himself declares, "*All sin is the work of the devil*" (C. P. page 12), and consequently where sin is there Satan must be also, as the cause. "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (I. John 3: 8.) Jesus said to the Jews, "Ye are of your father the devil." (John 8: 44.) This was not physically true; yet it was true. Hence it was a spiritual fact. They were the spiritual children of Satan. He was the father of the sinfulness in them. He is the father of all sinfulness in this world. Wherever sin is found, it has a satanic parentage

Now, the double-birth theology declares that inbred sin dwells in every soul which has not been the subject of double moral birth. As Dr. Wesley states it, "If there be no such *second* change, no instantaneous deliverance after justification, we must be content as well as we can to remain full of sin till death." If the soul is full of sin, then, according to this author, it is full of the works of the devil, and consequently the abode of the devil himself; for he certainly must be present where he works.

Thus we see that this mixed theology has God and Satan both dwelling in the soul of the believer in Jesus, the child of God. And Paul says the justified soul has peace. Isaiah says he has perfect peace. Admitting these sacred witnesses, and taking the testimony of these mixed theologians, we have before us the astounding idea that the human soul can be the peaceful, quiet abode of both God the enemy of all unrighteousness, and Satan the sworn, implacable foe of all moral purity, beauty, loveliness, and peace. Then Paul was quite impertinent when he asked the incisive question, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial." (II. Cor. 6: 14, 15.) The mixed theology is wofully at variance with God's holy word.

OBJECTION 14.

IT TEACHES THAT THERE IS MORAL POLLUTION IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.

This is a very grave charge; but the doctrine stands criminated by the testimony of its ablest and most zealous advocates.

1. The sacred Scriptures and the advocates of this doctrine agree in affirming that every regenerate person bears the divine image. These theologians all agree that the church at Corinth needed "the second work," when Paul wrote his letters to them. And Paul declares in his second letter—3: 18—"We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image." Thus it is clear that all Christians bear the image of God.

Bishop Castle declares precisely the same truth, but, if possible, with a sharper definiteness. He says, "Every feature of the divine nature or image is imparted to the child of grace at regeneration. Every element of a man in Christ Jesus may be found in the babe in Christ." (*Ans.* 4 *in Tel. June* 19, 1878.) This is very explicit. "EVERY feature of God's image, EVERY element of the mature Christian, are found in the infant Christian." This is in perfect harmony with Paul. It is certainly correct.

But a question here arises, Does the divine image, which is imparted in *every feature* to the child of grace at conversion," occupy the entire soul? or is the soul divisible into parts or sections? And does the divine image occupy a section or several sections, leaving the rest to be occupied by the "sin, the hidden abominations, the pride, self-will, the works of the devil, the carnality and hell," which these sapient theologians unanimously declare reside in it simultaneously with the indwelling of the Holy One? We will let Bishop Castle answer the question for us. Surely his answer will be acceptable with all his brethren of like faith. In his elaborate answer to the question, "Can a man be half Christian and half sinner at the same time?" he says:

"We must be careful not to employ a philosophy that is too physical in treating spiritual subjects. * * * When we can determine the mind by geometrical measurement, and for convenience cut it into sections at will, then, and not till then, may we determine the *quantum* of purity and impurity resident at any one time in the soul." (*Tel.*, *June* 26, 1878.)

This is very fine, and the bishop is a good witness agreeing with every true metaphysician that the soul is an indivisible unit. Hence it becomes obvious that whatever moral character attaches to a

part of the soul, must necessarily attach to its entire being. It would be nonsensical to talk of a part of the soul loving and the rest hating God, or his law, or his ways; or to talk of a part of the soul being pure and the rest being impure. Yet in the very next sentence after the one above quoted concerning the "features of the divine image," the bishop declares, "But these [features] exist in a nature as yet studded or interlarded with evil. The new life, with all the elements requisite to constitute it, is commenced in the soul, but a complete death unto sin is not reached until this mixed moral state issues in one purely homogeneous.' (Hereafter the reader will not accuse me of severity in the use of the expression "mixed theology.")

Thus we see that this theology mixes sin with the divine image in the soul. It declares—what we all know—that the entire divine image of God is impressed on the soul at conversion; that the soul is an indivisible unit; and that therefore whatever is impressed on any part of the soul must necessarily be impressed on *every* part of it; that is, on the entire soul. And yet it declares that the soul is full of sin at the same time. Then sin must be blended with the divine image. There is no escaping this conclusion from the premises they lay down. Its deductions are blasphemous. It should be abandoned by every sensible man.

OBJECTION 15.

IT TEACHES THAT GOD JUSTIFIES SOULS AND FILLS THEM WITH LOVE, JOY, PEACE, AND THE HOPE OF ETERNAL GLORY WHILE IN THE NEGLECT OF DUTY AND IN THE VIOLATION OF HIS HOLY LAW.

God commands all men everywhere, "Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God am holy." (Lev. 19: 2.) "Be filled with the Spirit." (Eph. 5: 18.) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." (Matt. 22: 37–40.) Paul declares, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." No man dare deny that these commandments, which embrace all God's moral requirements, are binding on every moral being, whether he be justified or not. All God's law is binding on all men. The sum of its requirements is love to God and love to all men. And no man dares to say that he is exempt from its requirements. God says, "Behold, NOW is the accepted time; behold, NOW is the day of salvation." Dr. Wood after Dr. Wesley says, "With God one day is as a thousand years; it plainly follows that

the quantity of time is nothing with him. Centuries, years, months, days, hours, and moments are exactly the same; consequently he can as well sanctify us in a day after we are justified, as a hundred years. There is no difference at all." (P. L. pp. 70, 71.) Well, then, is there no difference at all with God as to time; and especially if the condition of both justification and sanctification is simple faith, as we have seen, how dare any man say that they do not both occur at the same moment. Not a shadow of evidence or of reason can be shown for a chronological division of the two events, unless we throw away the data just now taken from the sacred word and these eminent doctors. The point to which we are drawing special attention just now is, that it is every man's duty to be holy. On this point these doctors perfectly harmonize with the Scriptures. But they seem to forget that their logic and tenets conspire to place the justified soul in the attitude of rebellion, and the rebellious soul in the category of the justified. Dr. Wood expresses the sentiment of his whole school of theologians, and also of Scripture, when he says, "A *free* and *full* salvation from *all sin* is the *present* and *constant* privilege and duty of *all believers*." (P. L. p. 71.) Very well. Can a man live one moment in the neglect of duty without incurring guilt? No man

dares affirm it. Does guilt harmonize with justification? No one dares to affirm that they can harmonize for a solitary second of time. Then no soul can, by any possibility, enjoy the justifying smile of God for a solitary second of time prior to the discharge of all the duties enjoined upon him by the perfect law of God. But they tell us that a soul can enjoy the sweet, justifying smiles of God through a long course of years in the neglect of duty and full of the carnal mind,—"enmity against God,"—and "sinful in thought, word, and deed." This is what I call mixed theology. It contradicts common sense, the sacred word, and itself. Let the leprous mongrel perish.

OBJECTION 16.

IT ASSUMES AND TEACHES THAT GOD LOVES AND APPROVES HEARTS THAT ARE FULL OF HATRED AGAINST HIM, AND OF ELEMENTS THAT TEND TOWARD THE SUBVERSION OF HIS GOVERNMENT.

Dr. J. A. Wood, quoting Dr. Wesley, says, "Though we watch and pray ever so much, we can not cleanse either our hearts or our hands. Most surely we can not till it please our Lord to speak to our hearts again—to speak the *second time*, Be clean; and then only the leprosy is

cleansed. Then only the evil root, the *carnal mind*, is destroyed. *Inbred sin* subsists no more."

Thus we see that the eminent *father* of these theologians declares that we are all possessed of the *carnal mind* until we obtain the *second* cleansing. All that can ever be done for us can never deliver from the carnal mind prior to the *second* effort of Deity.

Well, Paul declares, "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8: 7.) Now "enmity" seeks the destruction of its object. This is an undisputed truth. Enmity would dethrone Deity, murder Omnipotence, and place itself upon the throne of the universe if it could have its own way. All that saves the throne of God from the usurpation of Diabolus, or any of his subordinate devils or servants, is their want of power—the superior power of God.

And this same hellish disposition is by these theologians attributed to every child of God who has not had the double moral birth. And yet they never pretend to deny that each one enjoys peace with God. Dr. Wesley declares of the penitent, "In their trouble they cry unto the Lord, and he shows them that he hath taken away their sins and opened the kingdom of heaven in their hearts; 'righteousness and joy and peace in the

Holy Ghost.' Sorrow and pain have fled away, and sin has no more dominion over them. Knowing that they are justified freely through faith in Christ's blood, 'they have peace with God through Jesus Christ;' they 'rejoice in the hope of the glory of God;' and 'the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts.'" (C. F., page 9.)

And yet these are the identical persons of whom this same eminent father of the mixed theology declares they are "full of sin," "the hidden abominations, pride, self-will, hell," and "the carnal mind," which Paul declares is "enmity against God." Thus, taking Dr. Wesley in the use of Paul's terms and Paul's definitions of his own terms, we have millions of souls living and dying in possession of hatred against God and the most destructive elements of moral character, yet enjoying the approving smiles and justifying grace and love of God, and the blissful hope of eternal glory; for millions have lived and died in the justified, regenerate state without ever hearing of the "second work." They have either gone to hell, or else have taken their "*carnal mind*" to heaven to do its mischief there, or else they have have had it unconditionally removed at the moment of death. One of these three suppositions must be true if the doctrine under review were true. We know that neither is true. This sug-

gests a topic of thought that shall, if the Lord permit and help, have due attention on a future page.

OBJECTION 17.

IT BRINGS PERPLEXITY, CONFUSION, DOUBTINGS, AND OFTEN BACKSLIDINGS INTO THE MINDS OF CHRISTIANS.

Persons in the visible church who were never born again, persons who were unconsciously backslidden, becoming justly alarmed about their moral condition, and, under the leadership of double-birth theologians, seeking a better state, have obtained salvation. Others in the enjoyment of moral purity, but under the influence and direction of these theologians, have obtained a fresh baptism of *power*, as did the disciples on Pentecost, although, as we shall see, they were pure in heart before that memorable day. All these, under the directions mentioned, have gone forth declaring to others, in all sincerity, that they had actually experienced the second work. To any who might offer a word of objection they could say, "We have experienced for ourselves, and need no instruction on the point. We know what we have have experienced."

[I could name a gentleman who would listen to no evidence on the scriptural and reasonable side

of this question, and regarded nothing but his "EXPERIENCE." Afterward he acknowledged to me that he was not morally right. Said he, "I am not right."] Thousands of instances of the several kinds above named have occurred where there were none of the blind theologians to mislead them; and the thought of a "second work," additional to and distinct from regeneration, never once occurred to their minds, although their experience was precisely the same. But those under the instruction of these double-birth teachers have gone out to spread perplexity, doubt, and confusion in the minds of Christians; and in many instances they have caused backslidings, and even infidelity.

With a repulsive boldness they have disgusted some, and intimidated and captured others. The Christian is modest and humble. He wants all there is of redemption. When he hears a fellow-being with apparent sincerity declaring from experience the possibility of attainments apparently far above his own, knowing that human nature and surroundings tend to submerge the soul in moral pollution, and a crafty devil is constantly seeking the destruction of all, he feels distrustful of his own judgment, and is in many instances easily thrown into doubt concerning his own moral state.

Now the theologian, with much more zeal than knowledge, presses his doctrine and misleads a soul. Hester Ann Rogers, according to her own statements, lost her justification seeking the "second work." In desperate anguish she again laid hold on the eternal Arm, and was saved as before. But the contrast between the awful agony and the sweet peace was so great, and the second-work theology had been so thoroughly instilled by minds regarded as vastly superior and almost infallible, that she considered herself, beyond all doubt, in possession of a far higher moral state than ever before. This wide contrast after a desperate struggle has much to do with molding and fixing the opinions of noble minds in favor of the "second-work" theology.

A pious gentleman of my acquaintance was at one time so confused and, as it were, stunned by the bold declaration of an evangelist of the double-birth school who told him plainly that he was in a state of moral pollution, and needed a "second cleansing," that he could not pray. His pious wife became exceedingly alarmed and greatly distressed for him. After a long struggle in agonizing prayer for him she inquired if he felt any condemnation. He answered that he did not in the least, but yet his faith was so confused that he could not pray as before. Her agony for him

became so intense that he became alarmed for her physical and mental safety, and urged her to desist from praying and retire to rest. She could not. It was an alarming crisis. She feared there might be something desperate in his case; and he was alarmed over her distress. By means of the fact that he could feel no condemnation, he at last persuaded her to desist and retire to rest in slumber. On the following Sabbath this excellent gentleman, at church, was, in an extraordinary and, as he believes, supernatural manner, commissioned and empowered to bear scathing testimony against the destructive doctrine. He evidently fell into a trance, and saw the Lord before him, urging him to "get up and say what he could." He declined a long time. Still the glorious personage urged, "Get up and say what you can." At length he arose and commenced telling what he saw, when his tongue was unloosed, and he was remarkably empowered with the gift of speech. I was at the meeting soon after.

A few years ago a very pious lady became so confused with this doctrine that, under the dreadful burden of perplexity and desperate solicitude, she took the awful leap into the land unseen by stepping into a well for that purpose.

Whenever men undertake to gather testimony from God's Bible in support of a doctrine which

he never taught, they inevitably run into confusion if they persist in the belief of the doctrine. And when they undertake to teach such doctrine, bringing alleged proof from God's word, they run other minds into confusion. A number of young converts were rushed into confusion and driven from the religion of Christ by their pastor, who undertook to get them into the belief and practice of this "second-work" doctrine soon after they were converted. It occurred near where I write.

OBJECTION 18.

IT LEADS TO SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS AND SELF-CONCEIT.

This is one of its inevitable consequences. The man who confidently believes that he is superior to his neighbor can not possibly avoid feeling just as though he were actually superior to that neighbor. The man who believes himself in possession of a superior grade of religion to that possessed by his brother Christian can not avoid a corresponding *feeling* of superiority. A man's feeling, in such cases, will be governed by his belief. It is unavoidable. That a Christian should believe and *feel* himself morally superior to a vile sinner, a rough sensualist, or a niggardly miser is altogether proper, because it is a simple recognition of facts as they exist; and he could not avoid it

without violence to his own understanding. So by the same mental process, operating on false premises, the man who believes himself a specimen of a superior order of Christians reaches a conclusion which places him on the upper side of a wide contrast between himself and his brethren of a lower order. This falsely puts his imagination in possession of a degree or quantity of moral excellency which he does not actually possess. This, then, is imaginary; that is, unreal or *false* righteousness. And all such is *self*-righteousness. The conclusion is inevitable if we stick to Bible premises. He who fancies himself in possession of more righteousness than is requisite to render him a child of the Holy One is in possession of an imaginary, surplus article, orginated by his misguided imagination.

As to the matter of self-conceit, I could give the names of persons—not brainless, but misguided,—who claim a knowledge and perception of spiritual and divine things so high and great as to place them above the need of the Bible. This is a degree of self-reliance that is frightfully dangerous.

It is a thing so common as scarcely to need mentioning for this class of theologians to tell persons of unblemished piety, "You do not enjoy the higher life;" "you need the second work;"

"you need a cleansing," etc. I have witnessed this when I knew the self-constituted judge was laboring under a mistaken notion. He was an extensively-indorsed evangelist of the doctrine. His self-confidence seemed limitless. This is common with them. It gives them a "cheekiness" that is not sweet nor beautiful to men of piety and sense.

OBJECTION 19.

IT LEADS TO FANATICISM AND ANTINOMIANISM.

Whenever a man sets up his own experience, his own impulses and impressions, as the standard and rule of action, he is sure to become a victim of fanaticism. The word of God is the only infallible guide in matters of religion. The mind's eye should be kept constantly upon it. Every affection, every motive, every passion, every impulse, every desire, every thought, should be weighed in its balances, measured by its rule, and tested in its crucible. Whoever neglects this holy word runs wild. God doubtless quickens the perceptions, the memory, the judgment, the reasoning powers of his children when they pray to him in humble faith for such helps. He gives wisdom to those who ask him in faith. He gives spiritual and intellectual strength to overcome temptation

and to labor for his kingdom. He gives peace and joy. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace," etc. Love is partly emotional, and joy is purely so. Hence there is an emotional element in the Christian religion. Emotion is an essential part of Holy-Ghost religion; that is, the religion of Jesus Christ.

Yet he who undertakes to run by emotions, impulses, and impressions, apart from God's Bible, expecting God to guide him independently of his word, will surely run into fanaticism and antinomianism. He runs away from God's plan, and must therefore run astray.

John Noyes, founder of Oneida communism, and author of free-loveism, claiming Christian perfection, said, "If you want good instruction, close your eyes and look within." In perfect harmony with this sentiment, the tallest speaker, that is, the leading spirit at the National Spiritualist Convention in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1863, said, "Man has reached perfection only when he is perfectly free from all restraint from extraneous influences."

About fifty years ago, as I am informed by the president of a college in Michigan, who once resided in York County, Maine, where the society existed, an association of "Perfectionists" used to hold their religious meetings in a state of nudity,

to demonstrate their invulnerability to temptation. After awhile they disregarded the common laws of chaste society in their indiscriminate commingling of sexes, claiming that they were no more under the moral law, and whatever they might do was right, being incited by the impulses of pure hearts.

In Branch County, Michigan, a young lady and her mother became so holy—in their own eyes—that the daughter especially reached the conclusion that her mother could not retain her holiness unless father left home. She separated her parents. The good old man started for Pennsylvania, weeping, especially grieved because he was not permitted to "see mother and say farewell." The ladies were simply blind with "second-work" fanaticism.

A Mr. J. H., in Fulton County, Ohio, said (snapping his finger), "I would not give that for the Bible." Not that he repudiated the Bible; but he was so high in "second-work holiness," and so well guided by the Spirit, as he verily believed, that he was no longer in need of that book. He is far above it. I have known him well for many years. He is far from being brainless. He is naturally shrewd, and has an extensive knowledge of men and practical things. He has simply followed the *ignus-fatuus* of false doctrine till he has reached the quagmire of fanaticism.

In the same county an intelligent, wealthy farmer, perfectly sane on all subjects except the "second-work sanctification," feeling himself so moved by the Spirit, as he believed, seized a chair, smashed down a glass-panneled door, then threw the chair through a window, jumped through, and ran like a wild man.

In a village in Indiana an evangelist of the double-birth doctrine, with his band of helpers, undertook to heal a partially blind lady and to give hearing to a deaf boy. Of course, they failed; yet they maneuvered, with the help of a cheap editor of their own kind, to publish abroad some things that sounded like modern wonders. The wonder in the case is God's merciful forbearance toward the blind religious fanatics.

A Rev. Mr. W., a zealous advocate of double birth, thinks it would be perfectly right for him to do whatever he might feel inclined to do. He is so pure that nothing would be sinful to him.

A Rev. Mr. G., an eloquent and popular minister, thinks that he and Miss —— can sleep in the same bed in perfect innocency, because they enjoyed the "second-work sanctification."

The immortal Bishop D. Edwards was a believer in the doctrine here controverted, as he understood it. In reply to a letter of inquiry con-

cerning Mr. Edwards' latest views on the subject Bishop J. Weaver says: "I do not think that I know what Bishop Edwards' latest views were. This I know: Twenty years ago he preached and talked the doctrine of a second work strongly. For the last ten years of his life he did not preach it, nor talk it in my hearing. * * In regard to Walla Walla, he said that they were all fanatics. 'I never,' said he, 'saw such fanaticism in my life.'"

This Walla Walla conference of ministers all professed the second-work sanctification. When Mr. Edwards visited them as their bishop, they prayed God in the presence of the bishop, as I have been credibly informed, to "sanctify the bishop, or take him out of the way;" that is, kill him. This was long after the bishop had written a work entitled, "The Perfect Christian." Here, then, is a whole conference of ministers all swallowed up by fanaticism in consequence of this mixed theology, if we may believe the testimony of a very judicious man of God who once believed their doctrine, and possibly died in the same faith.

Dr. J. Wesley, the noted father of this doctrine, found some of this same wild fruit on the tree of his own planting. He says: "Some have left off searching the Scriptures. They said, 'God writes all the scripture on my heart; therefore I have no need to read it.' Others thought they had not

so much need of hearing, and so grew slack in attending preaching. * * It has led some to fancy they had received gifts of a *new kind*, after a new heart, as * * oneness with God; [this day I heard one of this class of men in church saying, "I am a part of God,"] * * sitting with Christ in heavenly places; the being taken up into his throne; the being in the new Jerusalem; the seeing the tabernacle of God come down among men; the being dead to all works; the not being liable to death, pain, grief, or temptation." (C. P., page 45.)

It seems the doctor was quite unconscious of the fact that this fruit necessarily grows on the very tree he planted with his own hand, and ostracised the noble, the immortal Count Zinzendorf for desiring to pull it up. We shall hear all about this in the "great day."

OBJECTION 20.

IT DIVIDES CHRISTIANS.

1. I assume that the professors of second-work sanctification, as found throughout the orthodox churches, and comprising a moiety of them, are genuine Christians.

2. That all justified persons are Christians is undisputed. Bishop Castle frankly says, "All re-

generate persons are clearly Christian, and will so remain as long as they maintain their justification." (*Tel.*, *Ju.* 26, 1878.)

3. Here, then, we have a large body of Christians comprising those who style themselves first-class, and those whom they style second-class Christians. Yet they are "all clearly Christians." No matter about the grade or order just now. *Christians* are the persons under consideration now.

4. That they are divided by the line of "second-work sanctification" is a fact so well known that it would involve an inexcusable waste of the reader's time to argue the case here. They are not only divided in doctrinal views, but also in sympathy, in feeling, in methods and means, in fellowship, and in practice. They do not labor in unison. They can not do so without a compromise,—a surrender of position and principle on one side or the other.

5. WHAT DIVIDES THEM THUS? It is not holiness. Holiness is repulsive to the careless, unregenerate heart, but not to the Christian. On this point we need no other testimony than that which is furnished us by these "second-work people."

Dr. Wood says, "Justification involves a desire to be holy. If a man is a Christian, and in a justified state, [all such, and none others, are Chris-

tians,] he will have the heart of a child of God, and desire to render to him a *present*, *full*, and *unreserved* obedience. This is implied in the very nature of true religion. (P. L., page 212.) Dr. J. T. Peck says, "Regeneration in its lowest state loves holiness, and pants to be filled with it." Mr. Caughey says, "A hearty desire for purity is the brighest gem that sparkles in *real* [there is no *unreal*] justification. If it be *genuine* [there is no other] this desire is always attached to it,—as weight to lead, as heat to fire, as fragrance to the rose, as greenness to a healthy leaf,—*inseparable*."

If, then, those who are considered the lower order of Christians even in their "lowest state love holiness and pant to be filled with it," it is simply impossible that holiness should be repulsive to them, or that its advocates should be repulsive on account of its advocacy. Neither can they be repelled by anything which holiness induces in the manners or appearances of any one. Thus it becomes indisputably obvious on the testimony of these self-styled "HOLINESS PEOPLE," that their superexcellent holiness has no part nor lot in the matter of separating Christians.

It remains, then, a fact beyond all doubt that the terrible work of division is accomplished by the false doctrine and its consequent spirit of caste, egotism, self-righteousness, fanaticism, etc.

A doctrine which divides Christians, and has no other foundation but a misunderstood "EXPERIENCE," can not be from God.

OBJECTION 21.

IT LEADS TO THE ABSURDITY THAT MORAL QUALITIES ARE INDIVIDUAL, PERSONAL ENTITIES.

1. It is an indisputable fact that in every case of regeneration there occur both an investiture and a divestiture of the soul. Something comes in, and something goes out. God comes in and Satan goes out. Moral purity comes in, and moral turpitude goes out.

2. But it is a fundamental principle in the second-work theology that moral pollution—sin—still remains after regeneration. If this idea were given up the whole "second-work" theory would cease to exist. If it were admitted that all moral corruption is removed at conversion, it would follow as an inevitable conclusion that there is nothing left for "second work" to do. This concession would annihilate the whole system in every consistent mind.*

---

*I have conversed with five persons who admitted that their hearts were made pure in regeneration, thus surrendering the foundation tenet of the whole system; and yet they tenaciously cling to "second work." Their reasoning must be "that it is *so*, because it *is* so, *because*."

3. It will not do to hold that the sin which they say remains in the soul after conversion is a part or element of its *nature;* for this would involve an absurdity so glaring as to meet only refutation and reproof from the most ordinary minds. Every soul is a "partaker of the divine nature" at the moment of conversion. (II. Peter 1 : 4.) "Every feature of the divine nature or image is imparted to the child of grace at regeneration." (*Castle.*) No being can exist with two antagonistic elements in its *nature.* Whiteness can not be blackness. Light can not be darkness. Falsehood can not be truth. Moral turpitude can not be moral beauty. Thought can not be substance. Love can not be diamond. Hope can not be quartz. Righteousness can not be *un*righteousness. Neither can two antagonistic natures co-inhere in each other, nor in the same substance more than in each other.

4. It will not do to say that Satan dwells in the regenerate soul,—though the principles of their doctrine necessarily involves the idea that he does,—for then every Sunday-school scholar would refute them with the quotation from Paul, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" seeing that it is agreed on all hands that Christ takes up his abode in the heart at conversion.

5. Therefore if they *will* have sin in the heart

after conversion, they are obliged to treat it as an individual, personal, physical entity. Accordingly, Bishop Castle, commenting on Luke 8: 14, says, "Here the wheat and the thorns grew together. They did not amalgamate; but they grew together in the same soil. So good and evil may be resident in the same moral nature, and may war with each other for the ascendancy."*

Sin and holiness, according to the bishop's view, may reside as near neighbors in the same soul; "not amalgamated," but *mixed*.

Dr. Wood, quoting Dr. Wesley, says, "How naturally do those who experience such a change [regeneration] suppose that all sin is gone; that it is utterly rooted out of their hearts, and has no more place in them! How easily do they draw the inference, 'I feel no sin; therefore I have none. It does not stir; therefore it does not exist. It has no motion; therefore it has no being.' But it is seldom long before they are undeceived, finding that sin was only suspended, not destroyed. Temptations return, and sin revives, showing that it was *stunned* before, and *not dead*." (P. L., page 61.)

Dr. John Wesley, in his sermon on "Sin in Believers," replying to an objector who had quoted the annihilating text, "They that are Christ's have

*See examination of 6 SCRIPTURE, under OBJECTION 24.

crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts" (Gal. 5: 24), says, "They have so; yet it remains in them still, and often struggles to break from the cross."

When a Roman soldier was crucified, he was put to death. When Jesus was crucified, he was put to death. Hence, in the New Testament, the word "crucified" always means put to death. Dr. Wesley utterly ignores this invariable meaning of the term "crucified"—sets it aside, commits the lingual absurdity of contemplating a thing as living after it has been crucified, and, worst of all, commits the metaphysical absurdity of contemplating a moral quality—the carnality of the unregenerate soul—as a physical substance in organized living form, susceptible of being knocked down, like a beast, lying "stunned, but not dead," or kicking and "struggling to break from the cross" after it has been crucified.

It is not only absurd, but ridiculous to contemplate the picture these theologians present of the regenerate soul. They have the Holy One, in every feature of his all-glorious image; the love, joy, peace, and glorious hope of his great salvation; Satan, his works, the stunned, struggling monster sin in all its hideous forms of pride, self-will, sensuality, boastful ambition, all the hidden abominations and hell, all within the narrow

limits of the human soul. Surely this is mixed theology. Nothing can be clearer than that a soul in such a condition would need a second clearing out. But it is a poor compliment to any man's metaphysical capacity to say that it is broad enough to take in such monstrosities. From such compliments deliver me. I wish no one to attribute to me the mental caliber to embrace the idea that the King of heaven with his kingdom and the king of hell and his kingdom, with all its hidden abominations, can dwell in the human soul together, and that soul be in a state of peace and joy at the same time. But we have clearly seen that just this monstrosity is embraced by the double-birth theology. It is a monstrosity unworthy a moment's entertainment. Let it perish.

OBJECTION 22.

IT MISREPRESENTS THE TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I am fully aware that this is an awfully solemn accusation. We shall soon see whether it is a just one or not. It is an awful thing for one man to misrepresent another. It is more so to misrepresent the Holy Ghost. And in this item, as I verily believe, the doctrine under review is a guilty party. Its advocates teach that the Holy Spirit speaks only of justification and regeneration to those who, as

they claim, have obtained only the first half of salvation, and that he witnesses sanctification to those only who have obtained the second half. Being utterly destitute of a syllable of scriptural evidence, the doctrine is obliged, as we have seen, to rest everything on "*experience.*" The Bible declares, and all Christians know by happy experience, that "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." (Rom. 8: 16.) And reason would demand, as also the very nature of the case, and the goodness of God would assure, that if there were two distinct classes of children in his family, distinguished by characteristics "infinitely" dissimilar, as Dr. Wesley represents (C. P., p. 23) the Spirit's witnessings to the individuals of the two classes should accord with their respective castes; for it would be a matter of the gravest importance to the soul of the lower caste that he should not be deceived with the idea that all is well when it is not the case; that he should know his pollution and be cleansed.

Well, the doctors have, with the most liberal gratuity, provided for the emergency arising out of the logical demand. Dr. Wood affirms that "the Holy Ghost is the witnessing Spirit. * * * The justified soul may know and be equally certain by the testimony of his spirit and the

witness of the Holy Spirit, that God has regenerated his nature and pardoned his sins. This testimony is more strong and clear than that of the convicted sinner. The sanctified soul may know with equal certainty by his spirit and the testimony of the Holy Spirit that God has cleansed his heart from all sin. This testimony is still more clear and strong than that of the merely regenerated. The inferential and corroborating evidences are equally as strong for the fully sanctified as in either of the other cases." (P. L., pages 98, 99.)

1. Evidently the doctor wishes us to understand that the testimony which the Spirit bears to the soul of his higher order of Christians differs in kind from that which it bears to his lower caste of God's children. He thinks the testimony to the justified soul is clearer to the fact of his regeneration than it is to the sinner of his sinfulness, which we all know is a mistake. When a man feels as if his sins would send him to hell in a short time if relief came not very soon, he has as clear an evidence of it as he can have of anything. So we see the doctor labors under a mistaken notion in the very first step of his graded testimony. When we think of wicked kings (as Richard) unable to sleep on account of their sins; of infidels and atheists—as Altamont, Francis Newport, and

William Pope,—suddenly cured of their unbelief by the burnings of remorse under the power of the convicting Spirit of a sin-avenging God; when we see men fall by scores and hundreds under the word of God, as grass before a sharp scythe—as at the great meetings in America's early history; when we hear thousands who are full of hot prejudice against the Son of God, suddenly crying out under the sound of his gospel, "Men and brethren, what must we do?" we are forced to the conclusion that the Holy Spirit makes men to know as well as a man can know anything that they are sinners on the way to certain ruin. The doctor is certainly mistaken in the first items, page 2, of his three degrees testimony. But he goes on and says, "This testimony [given to his higher order of Christians] is still more *clear* and *strong* than that of the merely regenerate."

That some persons enjoy more powerful and thrilling manifestations of the Spirit at the moment of conversion is true. That the same Christian may at one time enjoy a greater baptism of power than at other times is also true. It was true of about one hundred and twenty disciples, including the apostles, on Pentecost. Although they were certainly "clean through the word which Jesus had spoken unto them on the night of the betrayal, yet on the inaugural of the gospel

on Pentecost they received a more powerful baptism of the eternal Spirit than ever before. But this was not to testify to them that they were a whit purer, a whit more sanctified, than they were on the night of the betrayal.* Daniel was not a purer child of God when, after a long, abstemious waiting before him he saw on the bank of the great river Hiddikel, the Ancient of days in his beauty as the three disciples afterward saw him on Mount Tabor, and as John saw him on Patmos with snow-white hair, countenance like lightning, eyes like lamps of fire, body like the beryll, arms and feet like burnished brass, as if it burned in an oven, a golden girdle about his waist supporting a snow-white robe extending to the feet. Daniel was possibly a wiser man after this glorious vision, and inspired with higher hopes for his people, and brighter visions of their future glory; but he was none the more a pure child of the Most High.

Paul was no purer after his enrapturing, unutterable vision of paradise,—that is, the heaven of heavens,—than he was in the moment when the Holy One removed the scales from his eyes and filled his soul with love divine. John was the same pure-hearted, "beloved disciple" after his wonderful vision on Patmos, that he was on the

*See Objection 24—11 Scripture.

night of the betrayal, in the morning of his Lord's mock-trial, and on the golden Sabbath morning of the gospel's inaugural on Pentecost. So every Christian may from time to time obtain brighter glimpses of God's ineffable glory and grow wiser, stronger, and more useful thereby, and be the same pure-hearted Christian from first to last. Purity is purity, and, as we shall clearly see before we close this volume, if God permit and help, purity complete is what every regenerate soul possesses; it is an essential element of the regenerate character.

But for the present we invite attention to the misrepresentations of the Spirit's testimony to the regenerate soul.

Dr. Wesley declares that the second work is "infinitely greater" than the first work in regeneration, "and of a different kind." (C. P., p. 23.) Dr. Wood, as we have seen, chimes in on the same key. Two grades of salvation,—two *kinds* indeed,—and two grades or kinds of testimony, we are taught by these divines to believe are brought to the soul by the Holy Spirit. Not a syllable of scripture is brought forward to support this theory; (for the best of reasons we know, namely, there is none,) but we are to believe it because they have "*experienced*" it. Well, experience is certainly good evidence when properly understood.

But we have seen that Bishop Castle's interpretation of his own experience flatly contradicts God's word. The experience dare not be questioned; but their interpretation of it is what raises the thick fog over their eyes.

Since then the question relative to several grades of testimony by the Spirit is to be settled by human interpretation of human experience, it is fair and proper to call up the witnesses on both sides of the case—or rather it is proper to call up disinterested, impartial witnesses. I am fully prepared to give the names of many unimpeachable witnesses in the laity and many in the gospel ministry, who will most positively declare that they were by the Spirit's power and testimony made to believe beyond the shadow of a doubt that their hearts were made pure from all unrighteousness in the first moment of their regenerated life. The sainted Michael Thomas, one of the most carefully conscientious Christians I ever knew, referring to the moment of his conversion, in presence of two thousand hearers, said, "I verily believe if God had given me any more it would have killed me."

I have already mentioned that at least five witnesses who were at the time believers of the second-work doctrine, declared to me that they "believed their hearts were made pure in the moment

of conversion." Surely their testimony will be acceptable with all.

But let us look again at a statement made by the father of this doctrine. Surely his testimony will be taken by his followers. We give his words as quoted by Dr. Wood thus: "Mr. Wesley says, 'How naturally do those who experience such a change—regeneration—suppose that all sin is gone; that it is utterly rooted out of their hearts, and has no more place in them.'" (P. L., p. 61.)

In the name of common honesty, I ask how could they rest in such a conclusion if it were not a correct one, while an honest, faithful, Holy Spirit is witnessing to them concerning their moral condition? Does the Spirit bear false testimony? The Spirit regenerates the soul, and in the same moment bears witness of the fact, fills the soul with peace and causes it, or at least permits it to believe, as the doctor declares, "that *all* sin is gone; that it is utterly rooted out of their hearts, and has no more place in them." Now, according to this correct testimony of Dr. Wesley's, one of three things is absolutely certain; either 1. The soul is correct in its conclusion, and all sin is actually gone; or, 2. The Holy Spirit deceives the soul with false testimony; or, 3. The Holy One permits the devil to deceive his infant

child, while with all its powers it clings to him for deliverance from the powers and deceptions of the ruthless destroyer. The second and third of these propositions are too unreasonable and unscriptural to admit for a moment. Therefore the first must be true. The Spirit neither deceives the regenerate soul nor permits Satan to deceive it. "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." (I. John 5 : 18.) This settles the question. Satan can not touch him while he clings to God. The Holy Spirit surely never deceives. Yet Mr Wesley says the "regenerate soul naturally supposes that all sin is gone and utterly rooted out." We all know that this is just what every regenerate soul believes; and the data now before us carry us to the inevitable conclusion that he is not deceived, but is actually free from all sin.

OBJECTION 23.

THE DOCTRINE IS A CHILD OF CONTRADICTION.

1. They differ in regard to its DEFINITIVE TITLE —"DOUBLE MORAL BIRTH."

1. The *Highway of Holiness*, a magazine under the editorial supervision of Bishop Castle, was much displeased with the use of the proper title

of their doctrine in a newspaper discussion of its merits. In the April number of 1879 it says, "He [Alwood] applies his artillery against a 'double spiritual birth,' a 'double moral birth,' a 'second spiritual birth,' a 'second regeneration.' Every one who is reasonably well versed in the theory of entire sanctification, as received by us, knows that the advocates of holiness do not uphold a second birth, but a blessing after the birth." *All* Christians hold to *many* "blessings after the birth."

But it seems that these more modern divines do not see this matter in the same light in which it was contemplated by their venerable father, Mr. John Wesley, and his first pupils. He, in speaking of the "second-work" sanctification, says, "This great gift of God, the salvation of their souls, is no other than the image of God stamped on their hearts. It is a renewal in the spirit of their minds after the likeness of him that created them. God hath now laid the ax unto the root of the tree, purifying their hearts by faith,* and cleansing all the thoughts of their hearts by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit. Having this hope that they shall see God as he is, they purify themselves as he is pure, and are holy, as he that hath

*In his sermon on "Sin in Believers," he tells us this is done in regeneration.

called them is holy in all manner of conversation. * * * The Son hath made them free who are thus born of God from that great root of bitterness—pride." (C. P., pages 7, 8.) Thus it appears that the doctor thought it requires a *second* moral birth to deliver the soul from "that great root of bitterness—pride." "Born of God from that great root," &c. On the tenth page of this same work he tells us that the regenerate soul "sees in himself all the hidden abominations, *pride*, self-will, and hell." On the eighth page he shows us that this pride which could not be removed by the first moral birth is removed at last by a *birth* "born of God from that great root of bitterness—pride."

Dr. Fletcher, a pupil of Dr. Wesley's, quoting his teacher, says, "And when the Lamb of God has brought forth his own meekness, &c., in our souls, then are our lamps trimmed and our virgin hearts made ready for the marriage-feast. This marriage-feast signifies the entrance into the highest state of union that can be between God and the soul in this life. This BIRTHDAY of the spirit of love in our souls, whenever we attain, will feast our souls with such peace and joy in God as will blot out the remembrance of everything that we called peace or joy before." (Chris. Per. Def. Sec. II.)

"THIS BIRTHDAY OF THE SPIRIT OF LOVE IN OUR

HEARTS blots out the remembrance of everything that we called peace or joy before."

So those earlier doctors looked at it. They called it a birth, and the day of its occurrence a "*birthday*." They thought we must be born again and *again*. Jesus taught, "Ye must be born again to enter the kingdom of heaven." But these doctors require a repetition of the moral birth to fit one for the glory-world. And these modern doctors hold precisely the same thing, all but the name. They see too well the strategic value of a correct, definitive name of the doctrine, and therefore suppress the natural offspring of their tenets; and when closely cornered and driven to the wall, they call it "a *blessing* after the birth." That would be a very great blessing indeed which would "blot out the *remembrance* of everything that we called peace or joy before," when that former peace is by Isaiah called "*perfect peace*," (Isa. 26: 3) and the joy is called by Paul such as fills the soul when it has the assurance of a title to heaven. (Rom. 5: 2; 8: 17.)

Dr. Wesley called it a blessing "of a *different kind* and *infinitely greater* than any before." (C. P. p. 23.) According to this the first birth amounts to simply nothing. Now we see that there is abundant reason in the nature of the case and abundant authority of the highest "second-work"

kind for using the definitive name "double moral birth" in speaking of this doctrine. The younger doctors should study well their system before they scold others for the use of explicit terms in speaking of it, and before they take positions in deadly antagonism to their own pet system.

2. Contradiction. On Consecration.

1. Some of these doctors say that the consecration prerequisite to the second moral birth is quite different, in *extent* at least, to that required before conversion, while others say it must be perfect before conversion; and they all hold positions that would require unreserved consecration.

Bishop Castle in answering the question, "Can a man obtain the pardon of his sins without a full and complete surrender to God?" says:

"If by the word surrender is meant consecration, I answer yes, for consecration proper belongs to a later and more enlightened stage of grace."

Here the position is definitely taken that a sinner may obtain pardon without consecration. This is an awful position for a gospel minister to take in the hearing of sinners, teaching them that they can obtain full pardon and stand justified in the sight of God while clinging to their idols. But the bishop was obliged to take this position or surrender his doctrine; for if he had acknowl-

edged the necessity of a full consecration prior to justification he would have been utterly unable to show what further the sinner could afterward do to obtain sanctification. Then he would have to concede that sanctification is obtained at the moment of justification, or else take the position that it is afterward *unconditionally* obtained.* No one can consecrate more than *all;* and if it were conceded that all must be consecrated to obtain justification, there would be nothing left to consecrate for "second work." Then the second-work theory would perish. And this would involve too heavy a loss for these theologians. The doctors and their theories must live if everything else perishes.

Professor Thomas C. Upham, author of three volumes on the second-work theology,—more than thirteen hundred pages,—in giving directions to the seeker of sanctification, assuming that justification is obtained without a complete consecration, says, "Such a consecration, therefore, extending to all that we are and all that we have, is necesssry. We are not speaking now of persons who are in the deadness of unconversion. We are speaking of *Christians*, of persons in a justified state, whose dead wills have been par-

*As we shall see, Dr. Wesley runs into this position to provide for numerous cases.

tially quickened by the Holy Ghost, and who certainly can do something in this way. Such a consecration, therefore, made with the whole soul and for all coming time is necessary. And it is so, first, because we can have no available faith in the promises of God without it.* It is a great complaint in the Christian at the present day, that there is a want of faith. If we may take the statements of Christians themselves, they do not *believe*†—certainly not as they should do. And why is it? It is because they have not fully consecrated themselves to God. In other words, they continue to indulge in some known sins. Such are the laws of the mind that they can not have full †faith in God as a friend and father to them, so long as they are conscious of voluntarily †sinning against him." (INTERIOR LIFE, pages 28, 29.)

These remarks nicely apply to the common sinner, but the pious professor carefully notifies us that he applies them to the Christian. It seems to me a gross misrepresentation of our holy Christianity, this "great salvation," and its great and holy Author, to say that a man with partial faith, partial consecration, and "sinful in thought, word,

---

*And yet he assumes that the sinner's faith was "available" and availing in obtaining pardon.

†Unbelieving, half-consecrated, *sinful Christians!* Yet children of God and heirs of heaven!

and deed," as Bishop Castle has it, "indulging in some known sins," as the professor has it, can be a Christian, a regenerated child of God. Here we see clearly the gross principles necessarily involved in this double-birth theory—partial faith, partial consecration, and partial deliverance from sin. No marvel that Bishop Castle, holding such views, should, in the frankness of his good heart, call such a being "half sinner and half Christian." Such is this mixed theology we are reviewing.

Jesus said, "No servant can serve two masters." But these doctors know better. They show us that a man can be a partial servant of God—even his *child*—and a partial servant and child of the devil at the same moment. "Whosoever committeth sin is of the devil." Should not such a theory be called mixed theology? Certainly it is mixed.

Well, as we have just now seen, Bishop Castle and Professor Upham precisely agree that a man can become a Christian on partial consecration, and continue to be a Christian and a sinner at the same time. Partial consecration necessarily involves the idea of partial faith; for consecration is *trust*, and partial trust is the cause of, or rather *is* partial consecration. The professor *avows* belief in the idea of justification on partial faith; and the bishop avows it indirectly by avowing belief

in justification on the entire absence of what he calls consecration. Thus they harmonize on the position that a man can be an unbelieving, partially consecrated, sinful Christian.* They also agree in contradicting themselves on this same point, as we shall see; and they are both contradicted by another valuable author of their own school, namely, Jacob Hoke, Esq. In the *Highway of Holiness* of Nov., 1879, Mr. Hoke says, "Consecration is but the unconditional and unreserved surrender of the entire being to God." Here is a sterling definition. It can not be improved. In the same article Mr. Hoke further says, "What is the difference between consecration for justification and consecration for entire sanctification? Consecration in both cases and in all cases must be complete and entire, or it is no consecration at all."

Here is sterling truth tersely stated. "Consecration for justification, and consecration for entire sanctification, in both and in *all* cases must be complete and entire, or it is no consecration at all." But Mr. Hoke overlooked the fact that when he wrote these words he made a clean and complete surrender of a foundation-principle in the "second-work" theory; for if the sinner must make "an unconditional and unreserved surrender

*See Castle's answers in *Telescopes* of May 28 and June 19, 1878.

of his entire being to God," in order to obtain justification, then there is surely nothing left to surrender or consecrate, in order to obtain a second work. Moreover, if such a surrender is the only prerequisite condition to entire sanctification, and this must be made to obtain justification, then where is the mind in the universe of God that can explain why they are not both obtained at once? There is none that can explain. It is astonishing that Mr. Hoke did not see this, and drop the absurd system. He makes God the author of duplicity. (See again Objection 9.)

As to partial faith Mr. Hoke, in a letter before me dated January 31, 1880, says, "In regard to the question, Can a soul obtain pardon, justification, on *partial faith*?' I answer, *No*. Faith in every case must be full and perfect, or it is not faith at all."

Dr. D. Steel (February 21, 1880,) says, "I do not know what partial faith is. * * * The penitent who has faith enough in Christ to trust in him and him only, will be pardoned. The soul that consciously withholds anything from God can not exercise saving faith." Thus the doctor holds to a perfect faith and a perfect consecration in order to obtain pardon. Yet he holds to "second work."

Dr. J. A. Wood, in harmony with Mr. Hoke

and Dr. Steel, says, "The consecration previous to conversion and that previous to entire sanctification, are essentially the same, both involving complete submission to God up to the present light of the soul." (P. L., p. 83.)

Well, the angel Gabriel can do no better. Paul says, "If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." (II. Cor. 8: 12.) Jesus says, "Where little is given little is required." The widow's two mites of brass money were greater in the Lord's treasury than the millions thrown in by the wealthy. "The Lord looketh at the heart." He considers the heart-sacrifice. Her heart sacrificed *all* that she possessed. None of the others did this. If any one threw in a hundred millions and had two pieces left he fell short of the widow's heart-sacrifice. She handed over *all*. That left none. So God requires every soul to place all on the altar of God's service, to be used as he may direct. This leaves nothing for mere self-gratification. "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." (I. Cor. 10: 31.)

Nothing short of complete, unreserved surrender will bring pardon to the soul; and to this we will now have the testimony of Bishop Castle and Professor Upham, according to promise on a preceding page.

The bishop says, "There can be no reconciliation between parties at variance, no extending of clemency from God to man, until the latter grounds his arms. For what does he surrender, pardon? Then of course he must cease his rebellion. * * To obtain pardon the sinner must, as already indicated, cease from his rebellion and possess the spirit of full and complete loyalty to the government under which he now seeks happiness and protection. * * * No one can secure pardon but by a fixed purpose to abandon all sin." (*Tel.*, *May* 28, 1878.)

This is explicit. The sinner must make a full and complete "surrender, ground his arms, abandon all sin, and possess the spirit of full and complete loyalty to the government under which he now seeks happiness and protection, before he can have pardon." This is the plain truth plainly stated. It sounds just like Mr. Hoke's definition of "consecration," which he says "is but the unconditional and unreserved surrender of the entire being to God."

Professor Upham says, "There is one leading idea which is common to both; [justification and sanctification] we mean the idea or principle of entire submission. In both cases, impressed with a sense of our own unworthiness and nothingness, we must be sincerely willing in the spirit of entire

submissiveness to receive all from God, and must receive it also instrumentally in the same way; namely, by faith." (Interior Life, p. 169.)

So we see that though these authors—Castle and Upham on one side, and Hoke, Steel, and Wood on the other,—contradict one another at first, yet they after all come together and harmonize in a complete surrender of a fundamental principle of their "second-work" theology. They agree that the only conditions of sanctification, namely, surrender and trust, are indispensable conditions of justification. And this leaves no additional condition to be met in order to obtain an additional work. Nor does it leave room for any reason why full salvation should not be granted at the same moment with justification.

3. Contradiction. On the dominion of sin over the justified soul.

Nothing is more common in the literature of the "second-work" theology than expressions indicating the idea that "merely regenerate" souls are full of sin and under the *dominion* of sin. Such expressions are found in their experiences and biographies with scarcely an exception. Their newspaper and magazine articles, their essays, and their reports of "holiness meetings," abound with

them. They seem to be in possession of a stereotyped opinion that all "merely justified," "merely regenerate persons," as they are pleased to call all who have not professed the double birth, are yet under the dominion of sin. And yet their highest authorities, when busied with some other point, and in fear of some scripture like that in John's first epistle, 3: 9,—"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin,"—furnish us with diametrical contradictions of this opinion. Let us have some of their unequivocal testimonies on each side of this important question.

FIRST THE AFFIRMATIVE WITNESSES.

Professor Upham has already been heard saying, "We are speaking of *Christians*, of persons in a justified state. * * * They continue to indulge in some known sins." (In. L. pages 28, 29.)

Mr. Hoke says, "What is the difference between the conviction of a sinner for sin, and the conviction of a believer for heart-purity? The convicted sinner trembles under condemnation and the conscious, impending wrath of God. The believer convicted for heart-purity is perplexed and grieved because of the existence in his heart of principles which tend to evil, as to pride, self-will, covetousness, evil speaking, impure imagination, etc.; and

also ["the existence in heart"] of a power from which he can not escape, which prevents him from doing many things which he desires to do, and compels him to do many things which he would not do." (*Highway of Holiness, November*, 1879.

Surely such a person is under the dominion of sin. A power from which he can not escape, which prevents him from doing good acts and compels him to do bad ones, is surely an enslaving power. Mark, it does not rest with the control of affections, thoughts, and desires. It controls *actions*. It restrains from duty, and irresistably impels to crime. Such is Mr. Hoke's picture of a Christian of the lower order. He is a slave to sin; sin inside and sin outside, "inbred and *overt*"—a slave to sin with a joint title with Jesus Christ to a mansion in glory. Rev. John Harden, in *Highway of Holiness*, August, 1879, says, "Pardon secures a title to a mansion in heaven." So it certainly does, as Paul declares, "If children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ." (Rom. 8: 17.) But the puzzle is about these slaves of sin being where they are said to have a right to be. If a slave of sin, or anybody else, has a right to be in heaven, would it not be wrong to bar them out? Certainly. And if they were in, what kind of a heaven would

it soon be? But so goes the mixed theology. I believe heaven is pure, and none but the pure have a title to it. God's ways and arrangements are equal and harmonious. But we must hear more of these witnesses.

Mr. Wesley tells us of some at London who professed entire sanctification, but who, he thinks, were mistaken; yet he regards them as justified Christians. He says, "But some who have much love, peace, and joy, yet have not the direct witness.* And others who think they have are nevertheless manifestly wanting in the *fruit*.† But *some* are undoubtedly wanting in *long-suffering* and Christian resignation. They do not see the hand of God in whatever occurs, and cheerfully embrace it. They do not in everything give thanks and rejoice evermore. They are not happy—at least not always happy; for sometimes they *complain*. They say, this or that is *hard*.

"Some are wanting in *gentleness*. They *resist evil* instead of turning the other cheek. They do not receive reproach with gentleness. No; nor even reproof. Nay, they are not able to bear contradiction without the appearance at least of resentment. If they are reproved or contradicted,

*"He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." (I. John 5: 10.)

†"The fruit of the Spirit is in *all* goodness and righteousness and truth." (Eph. 5: 9.)

though mildly, they do not take it well, but behave with more distance and reserve than they did before. If they are reproved or contradicted harshly they answer it with harshness, with a loud voice, or with an angry tone, or in a sharp or surly manner. They speak sharply or roughly when they reprove others, and behave roughly to their inferiors.

"Some are wanting in *goodness*.* They are not kind, mild, sweet, amiable, soft, and loving at all times, in their spirit, in their words, in their looks and air in the whole tenor of their behavior; and that to all, high and low, rich and poor, without respect of persons, particularly to them that are out of the way, to opposers, and those out of their own household. They do not long, study, and endeavor by every means to make all about them happy. They can see them uneasy and not be concerned,—perhaps they make them so,—and then wipe their mouths and say, 'Why, they deserve it. It is their own fault.'

"Some are wanting in *fidelity*, a nice regard to truth, simplicity, and godly sincerity. Their love is hardly without *dissimulation*—something like guile is found in their mouth. They are smooth to an excess, so as scarce to avoid a degree of fawning, or of seeming to mean what they do not.

*See Eph. 5: 9. All Christians have the Spirit.

"Some are wanting in *meekness*, quietness of spirit, composure, evenness of temper. They are up and down, sometimes high and sometimes low; their mind is not well balanced. Their affections are either not in due proportion—they have too much of one, too little of another; or they are not duly mixed and tempered together, so as to counterpoise each other. Hence there is often a jar. Their soul is out of tune, and can not make the true harmony.

"Some are wanting in *temperance.*" (C. P., pages 41, 42.) Paul declares, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, [fidelity, truthfulness,] meekness, temperance." (Gal. 5: 22, 23.)

But Mr. Wesley's matter-of-fact picture of what he calls justified Christians is, by his own testimony, wanting in every item of the fruit of the Spirit. But it is admitted on all hands that the Spirit dwells in every Christian. Hence we must conclude that his lower class of Christians were simply backsliders—if they ever were born again. They were under the dominion of sin, destitute of of the invariable graces of the Spirit, revengeful, morose, surly, unkind, ["the fruit of the Spirit is in *all* goodness and righteousness and truth,"] untruthful, intemperate. This is a picture of Christian character, such as no inspired writer ever

drew. But it is the "second-work" picture. The witness—the eminent witness of all second-work witnesses—is before us. His testimony on this point is all we are after just now. We have it; let us call another witness on the stand.

Bishop Castle says, "So good and evil may be resident in the same moral nature. * * * The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy. * * * The lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not of the Father, but is of the world. Is there no seeking of fleshly gratification, no sensual and impure desires, no love of parade, gaudy dress and costly decoration among Christian people, no seeking of honorable distinctions and loud boastings of office and position among Christian men and even ministers of the word? Whence do these come but from the impurity that *yet reigns within?* Indeed, this is so apparent that to pause for reasoning upon it is but to contradict a judgment that has ripened into unquestioned certainty." (*Tel.*, *June* 19, 1878.)

Here the bishop unequivocally teaches us that lasciviousness, pride, envy, worldly ambition and bombast are perfectly compatible with the Christian character—the regenerate state. The Christian is in the justified state. Then, of course, all that is in him is justified. Then it would follow from the bishop's picture that God justifies lasciv-

iousness, pride, envy, worldly ambition and bombast. We know that God condemns all these. Hence we know they are not elements in the Christian character; nor can he be a Christian in whom they reign. Yet the bishop calls him a Christian in whom "impurity *reigns*." Where impurity reigns Christ can not reign at the same time. This is as evident as that two and two are four. But Christ reigns in the hearts of all his children; therefore impurity can not reign there.

But we have seen that the bishop believes that the whole church at Corinth consisted of carnal Christians. He says, "The apostle would say that they were sinful in thought, in word, and in deed." *Tel., June* 19, 1878.

We have seen that he puts himself in the same category in relating his own experience, saying, "I felt that in a certain sense I had been crucified with Christ, but still the body of this death seemed yet to cling to me. The form of that old life incumbered and sometimes ENSLAVED ME. * * I felt myself CARNAL, SOLD UNDER SIN. *For that which I allowed not that I did; and what I would do that I did not.*"

This language makes out a very decided case of bondage, a soul under the dominion of sin. No control of his own moral nature. It was under the dominion of the enemy of all righteousness.

Yet he thinks he was a Christian, enjoying a title to heaven, a child of God and justified in his carnal slavery to sin. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." But the bishop thinks this enmity against the holy One is no bar to his justifying mercy. He borrows language employed by Paul in Rom. 7: 14–25, to describe the helpless bondage of the sinner in his unregenerate state, to picture his own case, erroneously supposing Paul was picturing his own condition after conversion and prior to sanctification. This is, as we shall see* from very high "second-work" authority, a grave mistake into which opposite extremists have fallen. A misinterpretation of that chapter—over which so many divines have so shamefully slandered the holy apostle—assisted the bishop's imagination in coloring his own case and placing it in the wrong catalogue. He ought to have given more earnest heed to the language of that apostle when defining the carnal mind in the seventh verse of the next chapter; then would he have clearly seen that a man can not be a child of God, a Christian in any sense, and in possession of the carnal mind. "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Such is Paul's unequivocal testimony. Yet the bishop thinks he was "CARNAL, SOLD UNDER

*See Objection 24–1 Scripture.

SIN," and "DELIGHTED IN THE LAW OF GOD," all in the same moment. Careful attention to Paul's consistency would have shown him that such a moral state can not exist any more than a corrupt tree can bring forth good fruit. The thing is simply impossible. No, not the "*thing;*" for there is no such "*thing;*" nor can there be such a thing. The terms of the phrase, "a carnal mind delighting in the law of God," express an impossibility. A mind in harmony with and in enmity against God at the same moment can not exist. God can no more put up such a constitution than he can be—*as he is*—the embodiment of all moral beauty and inexpressible loveliness and Satan at the same time. Men ought to be careful, especially public teachers, how they throw out ideas which impeach the consistency of God's holy word, caricature the laws of mind, and set aside all consistency of thought.

"CARNAL, SOLD UNDER SIN," YET "DELIGHTING IN THE LAW OF GOD ALL THIS TIME;" that is to say, "A SLAVE TO SATAN AND SIN, LOVING GOD'S LAW AND HATING HIS PERSON AND LAW ALL AT ONCE. A CHILD OF GOD ON THE WAY TO HEAVEN, AND A CHILD OF THE DEVIL, FULL OF ABOMINATIONS, PRIDE, LASCIVIOUSNESS, ENVY, AMBITION, AND HELL ALL AT ONCE," are the absurdities embraced by all who embrace this double-birth system. All who hold that a man can be a

Christian and polluted with the carnal mind hold to these absurdities, and are against God's holy word.

But we must hear yet one more witness on the affirmative side of the question, "Does sin hold dominion over the justified soul?" and then proceed to see how many of them we can get to testify on the negative side. Possibly we shall be able to coax them all over to testify against themselves. Let us now hear Dr. J. A. Wood. In giving his experience in his work on "Perfect Love" he says, "During the first five or six years of my experience I was often perplexed and distressed with doubts in regard to the reality of my conversion, arising from the fact that I could not fix upon the precise time when the change was wrought. * * * * I was often conscious of the deep-rooted inward evils* and tendencies in my heart unfriendly to godliness. I found my bosom foes troubled me more than all my foes from without. They struggled for the ascendency. They marred my peace.† They obscured my spiritual vision.¶ They were the instruments of sore temptation. They crippled my efforts to do good. They invariably sided with Satan. They occupied

---

*All those should speedily get "the second" or the first work.

†See Isaiah 26: 3; Rom. 5: 1.

¶ I. John 1: 6.

a place in my heart which I knew should be possessed by the Holy Spirit. They were the greatest obstacles to my growth in grace, and rendered my service to God but partial. I was often more strongly convicted of my need of inward purity than I ever had been of my need of pardon. God often showed me the importance and necessity of holiness as clear as a sunbeam. I seldom studied the Bible without conviction of my fault in not coming up to the Scripture standard of salvation. I often commenced seeking holiness, but at no time made any great progress, for as I read and prayed some duty was seen to present itself which I was unwilling to perform, and so I relapsed into indifference. * * I became somewhat prejudiced against even the Bible terms "*sanctification*," "*holiness*," "*perfection*," and disliked very much to hear persons use them in speaking of their experience. * * I felt disposed to discourage and oppose direct efforts for the promotion of holiness.* If a pious brother exhorted the preachers to seek sanctification, or the members to put away worldliness, tobacco, and gaudy attire, and seek holiness, I was distressed in spirit and disposed to find fault. * * * In May, 1858, I was appointed to the Court-Street Church, Binghampton.

---

*A preacher opposing holiness! Shocking! No wonder conscience distressed him.

I went there much prejudiced against the profession of holiness* in that church, and they were, doubtless, somewhat prejudiced against me, as they had cause to believe that I might oppose them on the subject of holiness. * * * * God only knew the severe struggles I had that long summer, during many hours of which I lay on my face in my study, begging for Jesus to cleanse my poor, unsanctified heart; and yet I felt unwilling to make a public avowal of my feelings, or to ask the prayer of God's people for my sanctification.†

* * * The Lord had so humbled my heart that I was willing to do almost anything to obtain relief. After a few moments' reflection I replied, 'Immediately after preaching I will appoint a meeting in this tent on the subject of holiness, and will ask the prayers of the church for my own soul.' The Rubicon was passed. In an instant I felt a giving away in my heart, so sensible and powerful that it appeared rather physical than spiritual. In a moment after I felt an indescribable sweetness permeating my entire being. * * And let me here say, that a willingness to humble† myself and take a decided stand for holiness,

---

*"Died, all but dreary, solitary pride.
* * * * * * * * * Poor man!
Ashamed to ask, and yet he needed help."
"God resisteth the proud." (Jas. 4: 6.)

†"But giveth grace to the humble." (James 4: 6.)

and face opposition to it in the church, and take the odium of being a professor of holiness in Binghampton, where that doctrine had been trailing in the dust for years, constituted the turning-point with me. After I reached that point I seemed to have no special consciousness of believing, or submitting, or making any effort; my whole being seemed simply and without effort to be borne away to Jesus." (Pages 295–305.)

No doubt "borne *away* to Jesus;" for Jesus is certainly at a great moral distance from every soul in the moral condition the doctor's pen has clearly represented him. According to his own statements, he was a proud, stubborn opposer of holiness, living consciously in a state of moral impurity for a long time, and was daily reproved by the word of God and his own conscience. "If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things." (I. John 3: 20.) He says, "I often commenced seeking holiness, but at no time made any great progress; for, as I read and prayed, some duty was seen to present itself which I was unwilling to perform, and so I relapsed into *indifference*." Here was a will stubbornly fixed against known duty. Nothing can be more evident. And yet the doctor wishes us to believe that he was a Christian all this while, a justified child of God, on his way to heaven

and yet refusing to do what he knew God wanted him to do, thus walking not in the strait way of self-denial, but in the broad road of self-gratification, pride, self-will, and destruction. He closed his eyes in careless indifference to his moral state. No man can do this in innocence. It is a crime against himself and his God.

"My inward foes," he says, "interrupted my communion with God. They ivariably sided with Satan." His heart did not commune with God, but with Satan. A fearful caricature of the Christian heart! God rejected and Satan embraced! "No servant can serve two masters."

"They ["bosom foes"] occupied a place in my heart which I *knew* should be possessed by the Holy Spirit." The Holy Spirit was crowded out; and he *knew* the enemy of souls was in possession; *knew* it was wrong for him to remain so; *knew* it well enough to become exceedingly troubled about it, and seek for a different state, till a neglected duty would stare him in the face, an idol would be exposed to view, then stubbornness and pride would assert themselves, and he would close his eyes and ears against duty and the holy truth and Spirit which had quickened his apprehension, and so settle back into stolid indifference. He tells the story himself, and doubtlessless truthfully. He should not blame his readers for believing his

words and taking them according to their import. It is the same old "second-work" story, representing carnality for Christianity, while every reader of common understanding, and not under a theological fog, can see that God's holy word places them as far apart as God and Satan, and as light and darkness. As soon as the doctor repudiated his *pride* it came to pass in his case, as in all cases of conversion, that Christ and his soul had an instantaneous meeting and a heavenly communion. The doctor is a sufficient witness in the case. All the objection that can reasonably be offered to the whole experience is that he does not properly catalogue his moral state prior to the moment when he thrust away the stubborn pride from his heart, became honest with himself and his God, and was saved by a gracious Redeemer. Pride is always hateful to God, and utterly incompatible with the regenerate state. No soul can stand justified before God while clinging, as the doctor did, to a position which it believes to be morally wrong. God invariably condemns the soul which condemns itself.

Now, we have before us the testimony of Upham, Wesley, Castle, Hoke, and Wood, affirming that sin holds dominion over the justified soul—over the Christian.

Let us now hear some of these divines ON THE

NEGATIVE of this question. Let us begin with Dr. Wood, as he is yet before us on the "witness-stand"—and this class of theologians are specially fond of that stand.

Dr. Wood says, "The conditions of receiving justification and regeneration are the conditions of retaining them. 'As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him.' Christ is received by complete submission and present, simple, naked faith. Conscious confidence and conscious guilt can not exest in the same heart at the same time. * * Justification can not be retained one hour with any less submission, consecration, and faith than that by which it was obtained. * * There must be a continued obedience to all the known will of God,* if we would retain a justified state; for 'he that committeth sin is of the devil,' and, 'whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.'" (P. L., pages 25, 26.)

This is very clear testimony on the negative of the question before us, and, of course, against his former testimony. In that he showed us that he closed his eyes against duties which were made plain by reading God's word and prayer. Yet he wished us to understand that he was a justified

*Then it will not do to close our eyes against duty, and sink back into indifference, as he did.

Christian all the while. Now he tells us, "There must be a continued obedience to all the known will of God, if we would retain a justified state."

Dr. Watson says, "In this regenerate state the former corruptions of the heart * * are not even his inward habit, and have *no dominion*."

Dr. L. Lee says, "The power of sin is broken, the tyrant is dethroned, and his *reign ceases* in the soul at the moment of regeneration. * * The moment he does what he knows to be a sin, or neglects what he knows to be a duty, faith, by which he is justified, lets go its hold upon Christ, and he loses his justification. * * The will is right at the moment of regeneration; and it must remain right, or willful sin will be the result, and justification will be lost."

Mr. Hoke says, "What is the difference between consecration for justification and consecration for entire sanctification? Consecration in both cases, and in *all* cases, must be complete and entire, or it is not consecration at all." (*Highway of Holiness, Nov.*, 1879.) We all know that sin has no dominion over the soul which is in a state of complete consecration to God. Mr. Hoke says it must be in this state in order to obtain regeneration. Thus it follows from his latest testimony that sin can have no dominion over the regenerate soul. But this differs very materially from his

testimony on the affirmative of this question, in which he told us of "a power" existing in the heart of "the believer" from which he can not escape, which prevents him from doing many things which he desires to do, and *compels* him to do many things which he would not do.

Professor Upham says, "In both cases [regeneration and sanctification], impressed with a sense of our own unworthiness and nothingness, we must be sincerely willing, in the spirit of ENTIRE SUBMISSIVENESS, to receive all from God, and must receive it also instrumentally in the same way; namely, by FAITH. (*Interior Life, page* 169.)

Where there is entire submissiveness and faith in God there can be no rebellion against him, no "continuing to indulge in known sins," as the professor had it in his former testimony, and consequently no dominion of sin over the soul. All agree that entire submission to God, trusting all iu his hands, is utterly incompatible with the dominion of sin in the soul. They can not exist together. Hence the professor's latter testimony conflicts with his former.

Bishop Castle says, "All regenerate persons are clearly Christians, and will so remain as long as they maintain their justification. When that is lost they cease to be Christians. SOME PERSONS SEEM TO THINK THAT A STATE OF JUSTIFICATION ALLOWS OF SINNING." (*Tel., June* 26, 1878.)

Here the idea of a Christian sinning seems quite repugnant to the bishop's opinion of the Christian character. He seems to take a very different view of things now from that which he entertained when we had him on the "stand" before. Then he thought that "the apostle would say" of the Christian church at Corinth "that they were sinful in thought, in word, and in *deed*;" that Christians "seek fleshly gratification," indulge "sensual and impure desires, love of parade, gaudy dress, and costly decoration, seek honorable distinctions," and indulge in "loud boastings of office and position." He seemed impatient over any who might be pleased to offer a word of contradiction, and says the facts are "so apparent that to pause for reasoning upon them is but to contradict a judgment that has ripened into unquestioned certainty." (*See Telescope, June* 19, 1878.)

Well, as we have seen, the bishop in his later testimony ventures to "contradict a judgment that has ripened into unquestioned certainty," and seems to scorn the very thought that "justification allows of sinning." Thus Bishop Castle of June 26 is against Bishop Castle of June 19, of the same year. But let us hear the rest of his testimony on the negative of this question.

In answering the question, "Can a soul obtain the pardon of its sins without a full and complete

surrender to God?" the bishop says, "He must cease his rebellion and possess the spirit of full and complete loyalty to the government under which he now seeks happiness and protection. * * No one can secure pardon but by a fixed purpose to abandon *all* sin."

1. No sinner can abandon more sin than "*all* sin."

2. No one can at any time possess a more loyal spirit than "the spirit of *full* and *complete* loyalty."

3. Well, the bishop says, all this he must do before he can have pardon.

4. Now, can he retain the approbation of God and continue to be a Christian if he in any degree "goes back" from his "surrender," "cessation of rebellion," and "spirit of complete loyalty?" Surely not. All the witnesses are against such an idea.

5. To retain his justification, then, he must continue in the state of complete submission and loyalty to God. There must not be the least disposition of rebellion indulged for a moment. "Justification allows of no sinning."

Well, this is good testimony. But how does it agree with the bishop's former testimony, or with that given in his "experience?" We remember that in this he said, "The form of that old life sometimes enslaved me. * * I was

often brought into captivity to the law of sin. * * I felt myself carnal, sold under sin." (*My Experience, page* 3.)

But in defining regeneration he says, "Regeneration is defined to be the impartation of spiritual life to the soul, a change wrought within the soul by the power of the Holy Ghost, a renewal of our fallen nature, a radical change in the moral character, and deliverance from the bondage of sin." (*Tel., June* 19, 1878.)

This is fine testimony. But how does the idea of "deliverance from the bondage of sin" harmonize with the idea of "the form of that old life enslaved me," or, "carnal, sold under sin?"

Alas, for the contradictory mazes of the double-birth theology!

But let us now hear, on the negative side of this question, the eminent divine who gave us the long chain of matter-of-fact items concerning the London Christians, who even professed the second work, and yet were impatient, discontented, unthankful, unhappy, complaining, ungentle, vindictive, unkind, wanting in truthfulness, ill-tempered, morose, and intemperate, according to the testimony. Listen to the same witness on the negative of the question.

Mr. Wesley says, "Even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin." (C. P., page 4.)

Again he says, "In their trouble they [the unregenerate penitent] cry unto the Lord; and he shows them that he has taken away their sins, and opens the kingdom of heaven in their hearts, —righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Sorrow and pain are fled away; and SIN HATH NO MORE DOMINION OVER THEM." (C. P., page 9.)

Again he says, "We allow that the state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious. He is born again—not of blood, nor of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. He is a child of God, a member of Christ, an heir of the kingdom of heaven. The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keepeth his heart and mind in Christ Jesus. His very body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and a habitation of God through the Spirit. He is created anew in Christ Jesus; he is *washed;* he is *sanctified.* His heart is purified by faith. He is cleansed from the corruption that is in the world. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him. He worships God in spirit and in truth. He keepeth the commandments of God, and doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight, so exercising himself as to have a conscience void of offense toward God and toward man; and he has power both over outward and inward sin, even from the moment he is justified." (*See his sermon on "Sin in Believers."*)

Mark the concessions which, by the power of the lucid Scriptures, which stare every man in the face, this eminent divine felt compelled to make. Note the language: "*His very body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and a habitation of God. He is created anew in Christ Jesus; he is* WASHED; *he is* SANCTIFIED. HIS HEART IS PURIFIED. HE IS CLEANSED FROM THE CORRUPTION THAT IS IN THE WORLD. *He keepeth the commandments of God;* HAS A CONSCIENCE VOID OF OFFENSE.* HE HATH POWER BOTH OVER OUTWARD AND INWARD SIN, EVEN FROM THE MOMENT HE IS JUSTIFIED."

This is very clear and emphatic testimony against the dominion of sin over the justified soul. The fact is, these concessions amount to a full and complete surrender of all the ground on which the "second-work" doctrine rests. The entire foundation of the belief in the necessity of a second purification is the assumption that the heart is not made pure in regeneration; and this assumption is entirely surrendered by the noted father of the doctrine in the words above quoted, "HIS HEART IS PURIFIED." Mr. Wesley well knew that it is one of the easiest things in the world for every Bible-reader to show from the sacred word that every heart is made pure in the first moment

*Not like Dr. Wood, violating conscience and stifling conviction every day, as we have seen.

of its regenerate life; that the regenerating process is the purifying process.* He well knew that it is equally easy to show that every Christian is a sanctified temple of the Holy Ghost.† He makes these fatal concessions as if they were meaningless, —as if the sacred word were to be taken at fifty per cent below par,—and afterward undertakes, by his scholastic *ipse dixit*, to explain away half of the meaning of his own terms. It is pitiful to see one man put the opinions of another in authority above God's word. But with what terms shall we characterize the man who does so with his *own?*

Well, now, returning to our question under consideration, and looking at the witnesses and their testimony, we find that we have

ON THE AFFIRMATIVE

Messrs. Hoke, Upham, Wesley, Castle, and Wood, and

ON THE NEGATIVE

Messrs. Wood, Watson, Lee, Hoke, Upham, Castle, Wesley, and the Bible.

If they were all on one side and the Bible on the other, we should decide with the Bible; for that is always right on all questions discussed on

---

*See Acts 10: 44; 15: 9; I. Cor. 12: 13; Titus 3: 5-7.

†See I. Cor. 3: 16, 17; 6: 11.

its sacred pages; and we should receive its blessed truth, though it should impeach every man. But finding them contradicting one another, and some of them on both sides of the question, and some equally explicit and emphatic on both sides, we do well to let them pass by wholly unnoticed as religious guides, or, choosing to give them a hearing, sift their words carefully in the blessed, unfailing old Bible-sieve, reject what it rejects, and receive what it approves. When a man is on both sides of a question it is a waste of time to hear him, especially if there be an abundance of clear, consistent, unerring testimony at hand, as in this case.

4. CONTRADICTION. ON OBTAINING CHRIST WITHOUT OBTAINING FULL SALVATION.

1. It is agreed to on all hands that the blessed Redeemer takes up his abode in the heart at the moment of conversion. As Mr. Wesley says, "Christ does not give life to the soul separate from, but *in* and *with himself*. Hence his words are equally true of all men, in whatsoever state of grace they are. 'As the branch can not bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me.' 'Without [or separate from] me ye can do nothing.'" (C. P., page 16.)

Again, as we saw on a preceding page, speaking of the "merely justified," he says, "His very

body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and a habitation of God. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him."

This is not given because it is Wesley's language, but because it is Bible language given by Wesley, and therefore the more acceptable with all "second-work" people.

Paul said, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. 8: 9.) Jesus said, "Abide in me, and I in you." (John 15: 4.) So far we all agree. All Christians (not bogus converts and backsliders) have Christ dwelling in their hearts.

2. But if it were universally admitted that Christ imparts full salvation to every soul in whom he takes up his abode, the second-work doctrine would have no existence. Such a view would leave no room for the belief of second work. If Christ brings full salvation at the moment of his first coming into the soul, there could of course be no necessity for a second moral birth in order to bring the soul into possession of full salvation. Therefore they hold that he only half saves on his first ingress.

3. Yet some of the shrewdest and most popular of their writers are found on both sides of this question, as in other cases. At least, they give

decided testimony on both sides. When they have their eye on the vital point, the fundamental principle of their doctrine, they guard well their words, and testify according to the demands of the doctrine. But when they forget their fundamental principles in the discussion of other points they often bring forward too much Bible truth for the health of their doctrine. Let us hear them

ON THE NEGATIVE OF THIS QUESTION.

As the negative is the main basis of the entire theory, as such they all hold to it, and have all testified accordingly. Therefore it is only necessary to quote the language of their representative authors. We have already had before us quotations from the father of the doctrine, in which were brought to our minds the ideas that the regenerate soul is "full of sin, hidden abominations, the depths of pride, self-will, and hell, yet having the witness in themselves, 'Thou art an heir with God, a joint heir with Christ.'" We have had before us quotations from Professor Upham indicating that regenerate souls, real "*Christians*, do not believe as they should do, because they have not fully consecrated themselves to God. In other words, they continue to indulge in some known sins." (*Interior Life, pages* 28, 29.) We have

heard from Wood and Wesley that "if there be no second change after justification, we must be content as well as we can to remain full of sin till death." (P. L., page 60.) We have heard Mr. Hoke tell about the Christian having "in his heart principles which tend to evil, as to pride, self-will, covetousness, evil-speaking, impure imaginations, etc., and also a *power* from which he can not escape, which prevents him from doing many things which he desires to do, and compels him to do many things which he would not do." (H. H., Nov., 1879.)

We have heard Bishop Castle telling about the whole church at Corinth being "sinful in thought, in word, and in deed." We have heard him talking about "envy, pride, vanity, bombast, worldly ambition, lasciviousness in Christians." (*Tel.*, *June*, 1878.) We have heard him talk about a Christian being "enslaved, carnal, sold under sin, unable to do the things he would, or to refrain from the things he would not do." ("*Experience.*") Such is the tenor of all their authors.

Let us now hear the

ONLY REASON THEY ASSIGN WHY THE SOUL IS NOT FULLY SAVED AT REGENERATION.

Bishop Castle says, "Man is not only a sinner in act, but he is impure in state. But this im-

purity of state, as such, does not come into view until subsequent to conversion." (*Tel.*, *June* 33, 1877.)

In plain language, this means simply that IGNORANCE prevents the soul from being fully saved at the first effort of the great Physician. The patient does not fully understand his own case and state. Therefore the physician can not fully heal him. He did not know the full extent of the disease, and therefore he did not know just how much medicine to ask for. Hence the physician gave him only enough to effect half a cure, or less; for the remaining part of the cure to be effected "is *infinitely greater*, and of a *different* kind from any before." (C. P., page 23.) But why has not some one found out before making his application, and obtained enough to effect a complete cure at once? Could not some posted teacher teach at least one or two, so that there might be some exceptional cases?* "Oh, no," say these doctors, "it would *kill* the patient." Oh, ho! So then we have come to another reason, or rather a reason for the reason. Is this, indeed, the theory? Let us see. Mr. Wesley, speaking of the regenerate soul awakened —as he views it —to a sense of the importance of a second work, says, "And now first do they see the ground of

*We shall see that they have admitted some.

their hearts, which God before would not disclose unto them, lest the soul should fail before him, and the spirit which he had made." (C. P., page 10.)

How Mr. Wesley found out this remarkable idea he has not been pleased to inform us. We all know that there is nothing of the sort revealed in God's word. We know, too, that God commands his ministers to "cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people* their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." (Isa. 58: 1.) He plainly declares, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." (Jer. 17 : 9.)

We also know that Jesus in his first sermon taught the absolute necessity of purity of heart and moral perfection in order to reach heaven. We know that he most explicitly taught Nicodemus and us the necessity of a change of state, even an exceedingly important one—one that astonished that learned doctor of divinity in the illustration thereof. We know that Paul declares, "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." (Gal. 6: 15.) We know that he declares to all men, "Be ye holy; for I am holy." And yet these divines

---

*1. All nations and all men are God's property. 2. They were under his hierachy, and so politically his. 3. They were his medium of instruction to the world. 4. They were his by covenant. 5. By profession.

would have us believe that God intentionally leaves the soul in ignorance of its real moral condition till after it is born again, and even then, in the millions of cases that lived and died with the love of God in their hearts, but never heard of the "second-work" theology. If it is a matter wholly in his hands, as Mr. Wesley's language indicates, why does he not immediately, or soon after conversion, reveal the important matter to the soul and have it sanctified, since we know "it is the will of God, even your sanctification?" These divines tell us, "This impurity of state does not come into view until subsequent to conversion," because "God before would not disclose it unto them, lest the soul should fail before him."

Mr. Wesley has the whole matter in God's hands, it would seem, apart from his word. Well, suppose—which is true—that the sinner can not see the worst of his case by his natural powers applied to the word which shows him he ought to be holy but is not. We know that God does send his Spirit into the world to "reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." Now the only reason assigned by Mr. Wesley why God does not show him "his impurity as such until subsequent to conversion" is the (assumed) fact that the soul could not endure it,—it "would fail before him." Then we have before us the idea

that the soul is entirely in the hands of Almighty God. But this omnipotent Physician, possessing unlimited skill, resources, and power, is yet not able to communicate sufficient power to the soul to endure at once the entire cleansing process and life-communicating process; that is, power-communicating process. It must be acknowledged on all hands, and is, that the regeneration process consists of a cleansing that is a divestiture of moral pollution, and of invigoration, life-giving. How absurd the thought, then, that the soul would fail under the divine communication of divine power, life, and energy. It is like saying, "A man is so weak that if God should communicate the full strength of a man to him his strength would fail, and he could not endure it. He is so weak that the addition of strength would so increase his weakness that he would be overwhelmed. He is so poor that if great riches are given him it will so increase his poverty that he will be bankrupt at once." Bewildering contradictions are sometimes passed off for logic. The sophisms and assumptions of these divines are striking instances.

Bishop Castle insists that "the fact is, Christ is only unto his people what they by faith, in every instance, make him." (*Tel.*, *April* 30, 1879.) Isaiah says of the highway of holiness that "the

wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." Isa. 35 : 8.) But according to these divines and evident facts, millions have traveled for many years in the way to heaven (for all the justified are on the way to heaven, as all agree,) without ever once dreaming that they were constantly "full of sin" from want of the double birth, a thing of which they never once heard.

The fact is, no soul ever yet embraced Christ until it discovered to a painful certainty that it was in a lost state, and needed salvation. Under the influence of this awful discovery it looked around for a Savior. Learning that Jesus "is mighty to save and strong to deliver," it called in the great Physician, believing that he fully understood the case, and could and would save. He came in and saved because the soul trusted in him. (Ps. 37 : 4.) Not because he understood all about the case, but "because he trusted in him." He could never tell how Jesus regenerated him, how much power it took, how dark his stains were, only he believed that Christ is an all-sufficient Savior, able to save all that come, and casts out none that come. He trusted his case over into the all-sufficient Hand, and was instantly saved. Millions of very ignorant persons have been saved. They knew when they had Christ in the soul. They knew he filled them with love, joy, peace,

and glory. They knew they were in full harmony and love with him. They knew that he approved them. They believed if he condemned them not, no one else had a right to do so. So they passed their days, without ever hearing of the double-birth doctrine, died in peace, and went to heaven. Multitudes with much learning spent years in searching God's word, and died in sweet peace, without ever knowing anything about the double-birth doctrine. None of these, unbefogged by the theologians, ever once dreamed that they needed to instruct Christ just how much salvation to give them, how much purity, how much love, how much joy, how much peace, how much power. They supposed all the while that he knew a thousand times better than they did what to do for them, how to do it, and all about it.

"He that hath the Son hath life," however ignorant he may be.

Well, we have now before us, from the pens of these second-work divines, the following propositions:

1. The regenerate soul is in a state of moral pollution.

2. This is so because it did not seek moral purity as a state.

3. It failed to do this because it was too ig-

norant properly to apprehend its moral condition; and this is universally the case.

4. It was too ignorant to apprehend its need properly, because God would not fully reveal the case.

5. God declined such revelation because it would crush the soul.

6. God either *could* not, or else he would not sufficiently sustain the soul to endure the process. Which of these two suppositions is the correct one these divines, in their wisdom, leave us to conjecture. Either one is very disparaging to the character of our God. Either is a gross misrepresentation of his character, and can only proceed on the false assumption that it is not his will that the soul should be purified at the moment of regeneration.

Let us now hear the divines of the second work on the

AFFIRMATIVE SIDE

of this question. We shall find some on both sides.

Mr. Hoke says, "There is no more necessity to understand the theory of sanctification to attain to its experience than there is to understand the theory of justification in order to acquire its ex-

perience. * * 'May there not be instances where persons received the grace of entire sanctification at the time they were converted?' There doubtless have been cases where persons in the ardor of their first love have risen to a consecration so complete, and an effort so persistent, as to have received the blessing of entire sanctification, without having specifically sought it under that name. Received in this desultory way, in the fullness of their first love, with no perceptible difference in the blessing received, or time intervening, they may claim, as some do, that their sanctification and justification were simultaneous." (*Highway of Holiness, Nov.*, 1879.)

Here is a complete and formal surrender of the whole system. Here it is admitted that some have obtained entire sanctification at the moment of regeneration. Thus it is clear, beyond all question, that God has no rule or law against it. Nay, he is entirely in favor of it, seeing that he is the principal party and chief agent of all the cases which have occurred. Thus it appears also that God can communicate sufficient light and knowledge to the soul to enable it to embrace both regeneration and "entire sanctification at the time of conversion," without "the soul failing before him, and the spirit which he had made." The communication of a double portion of purity and

strength does not, according to Mr. Hoke's view, so enfeeble the soul as to cause it to flag, sink, fail, and perish. He can not see, with Mr. Wesley, that to strengthen is to enfeeble and crush. Nor can he see, with Bishop Castle, that "Christ is only unto his people what they in *every instance make him*," with respect to each and every feature of the great, wonderful, and mysterious work of redemption. Mr. Hoke attributes the success of what he regards as exceptional cases not to any special illumination of the soul, nor in its special seeking for a specific feature of redemption, but "to a *consecration* so *complete*, and an effort so persistent, as to have received the blessing of entire sanctification without having specifically sought it under that name."* *Complete consecration*, then, is the cause of success in these undeniable cases, which Mr. Hoke supposes to be exceptional and anomalous. But we remember that this is the identical witness who testified that "consecration in both cases, and in ALL CASES, MUST BE COMPLETE AND ENTIRE." We do not want him to go back on this now; for it is a fundamental Bible doctrine, as we have seen; and even Bishop Castle says, "To obtain pardon the sinner must cease from his rebellion, and possess the spirit of

*I should have given the reader an explanation before now of the lengthiness of quotations when perspicuity does not demand it. It is to avoid the accusation of unfairness with the authors.

full and *complete loyalty* to the government under which he now seeks happiness and protection." (*Tel.*, *May* 28, 1878.) "*Complete loyalty* to the government" of God surely involves perfect consecration. Thus we see from Mr. Hoke's own testimony, corroborated by that of Bishop Castle, the very thing to which he ascribes success in these supposed anomalous cases of "entire sanctification at the moment of regeneration" must precede each and every case of conversion. It only remains for us now to shake hands with Mr. Hoke, and thank him for the honest statement of truth and frank surrender of the double-birth doctrine.*

If, then, God has bestowed the blessing of entire sanctification on some souls at the moment of conversion because they made a "full and complete consecration, and if such a consecration must precede *every* conversion, then we ask, in the name of common intelligence, can any one assign a scriptural or a common-sense reason why the Holy Blessed One should not and will not bestow the same blessing on compliance with the same condition in every case of conversion? There can be no reason assigned. Therefore it remains that the work of regeneration and of entire sanctification always occurs at the same moment, and by

*It seems strange that Mr. Hoke still reckons himself with that class of theologians.

the same agency and the same process. There is no plurality about it. It is simply *one* work that accomplishes what is designated by different terms for the purpose of directing thought to different phases of the same thing.

Let us hear another witness on the affirmative of this question.

Rev. John Harden, giving his "experience," says, "The work the Lord did for me that day was done perfectly satisfactorily. I could not doubt it. Infidelity fled from the face of the conquering Spirit. The great God became my Father, and I received the consciousness of my sonship. * * Notwithstanding my conversion was so clear and unmistakable, conviction for holiness at once seized me. This conviction did not result from having sinned against God after my conversion; but it arose from an inward consciousness of my need of purity, and from a settled belief that it was God's will that I should be holy.* I was no sooner converted than my soul began to go out after the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. Every prayer was a cry for holiness; and every testimony was a confession of my need of it, and my determination to ask and receive, to seek and find, to knock and enter into the land of

*Doubtless under the instruction of "second-work" teachers. Otherwise this is a genuine case of Pentecost after purification. 1. Purity. 2. Power.

rest from inbred sin, the land of perfect peace.'"* (*Highway of Holiness, Feb.* 1878.)

This extract of experience is given as a courteous introduction to this worthy author, and that the reader may know of a certainty that he is a genuine "*second-work*" theologian. Now let us hear his testimony on the question before us; namely, "Can a soul obtain Christ without obtaining full salvation?"

Rev. Mr. Harden says, "He who carries the overflowing heart of an indwelling Christ is filled even unto all the fullness of God; 'for it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.' I am glad that God has placed the bank stock of man's salvation in Jesus Christ. He that gets Christ gets the bank and its contents. Hallelujah!" (*Highway of Holiness, April,* 1879—*Bishop Castle, editor.*)

Here is Bible testimony. 1. He that has Christ in him—as all justified persons have—"IS FILLED EVEN UNTO ALL THE FULLNESS OF GOD;" for in Christ all fullness dwells. 2. "God has placed the bank stock of man's salvation in Jesus." 3. "HE THAT GETS CHRIST GETS THE BANK AND ITS CONTENTS."

Is there *full* salvation in Jesus Christ? All answer, "Yes." Very well; then he that gets him

---

*Every justified soul has perfect peace. See Rom. 5: 1; 8: 1; Isa. 26: 3; Ps. 119; 165.

gets full salvation. This is Bible truth. But where, now, is the occasion or necessity for a second work in order to bring the converted soul into the possession of full salvation, when it has full salvation already, having obtained it the moment it obtained Christ at conversion? There can be no such necessity, according to this testimony. Hence we see clearly that the doctrine rests on a myth. It has no foundation in truth. But Rev. J. Harden's golden proposition, "HE THAT GETS CHRIST GETS THE BANK AND ITS CONTENTS," rests on a foundation firmer than the rock Gibraltar—even on the eternal word of the Maker of Gibraltar. Here it is: "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? (Rom. 8: 32.) "All things are yours." (I. Cor. 3: 21.)

Mr. John Wesley, speaking of the perfect Christian, says, "Every one of these can say, with St. Paul, 'I am crucified* with Christ; nevertheless I live: yet not I, but Christ liveth in me'—words that manifestly describe a deliverance from inward as well as from outward sin. This is expressed both negatively, 'I live not'—my evil nature, the body of sin, is destroyed; and positively, 'Christ liveth in me,' and therefore all that is holy and

*Here Mr. Wesley seems to have a better recollection of the meaning of the word "crucified" than he has in his sermon on "Sin in Believers." See Contradiction 3—Wesley in.

just and good. Indeed, both these, 'Christ liveth in me,' and, 'I live not,' are inseparably connected. For what communion hath light with darkness, or Christ with Belial?" (C. P., page 6.)

It is amazing that Mr. Wesley could so clearly see the three points which he so lucidly presents to our view, and yet could not see that they are fatally at variance with his doctrine. He says:

1. "'Christ liveth in me,' and therefore all that is holy and just and good. 2. Indeed, both these, 'Christ liveth in me,' and, 'I live not,' are *inseparably* connected. 3. For what communion hath light with darkness, or Christ with Belial?"

Thus he clearly teaches that whenever Christ dwells in a soul, that soul is dead to sin, "and ALL THAT IS HOLY, JUST AND GOOD" lives in it; that these facts are "INSEPARABLY connected" with the fact of Christ's residence in the soul. And he is careful to assign the Bible reason for the inseparability of the two facts: (1) The soul's death to sin, and (2) the life of the soul in all that is holy, just, and good; namely, (1) "Christ liveth in me," and (2) "light hath no communion with darkness, and Christ hath no concord with Belial." Now, admitting that Christ takes up his abode in the soul at the moment of conversion, it follows as an inevitable conclusion from the scriptural premises laid before us by Mr. Wesley that whenever a

a soul is born of God it at the same moment dies to sin, and commences a new life in "ALL THAT IS HOLY, JUST, AND GOOD." And the cause of this new, holy state of the soul is the fact of an indwelling, holy Christ, who will not dwell in an unholy temple, and can not harmonize with Belial, or Satan, who certainly dwells in the soul so long as there is sin there; for this same Mr. Wesley informs us that "all sin is the work of the devil."

When these men furnish us with so many overwhelming refutations of their own favorite doctrine, as Mr. Wesley has here, why should they or others find fault with us for rejecting it. When two witnesses contradict one another on a specific point it is fitting that we should reject both till we can learn the truth in the case from some other witness. But what shall we do with a man's testimony when he is not only contradicted by several witnesses who are interested in his favor, but even by himself? We have before us, on the question under consideration, Messrs. Hoke, Harden, and Wesley, against *all* the divines of this "second-work" school, Hoke, Harden, and Wesley included. We need to look to a higher source of light for the truth in the case. That blessed lamp of God is the Bible. When they obviously plant an argument on this, as Mr. Wesley evidently does in his last testimony before us, we are

bound to receive it. And this we do most cheerfully. But while we do this we are obliged, by the same argument, to reject his "second-work" doctrine.

4. Contradiction.—On Purification Instantaneous or Gradual.

The Hebrew shepherds were first to hear the grandest message of facts that ever greeted the ears of sojourners on our planet,—"Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling-clothes, lying in a manger. * * * *Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men.*" (Luke 2: 11, 12, 14.)

The divine plan in everything embraces 1. Divine FACT. 2. Divine REVELATION of fact. 3. Divine FAVORS on his creatures. 4. Divine GLORY. These four items philosophically merge into a trinity. The favors and the revelation of them naturally merge into one another; for nothing can in strict philosophy be a favor to a being until it is known to the being favored. Whether the author of the favor be known or not, is not strictly, in every case, the question. The favor itself must be known before it can be a favor. A favor in prospect, unknown to the—so-called—

favored party, is not to him a favor; though the thing proposed, but unknown to him, may some time *become* a favor, yet it is not now a favor. Either the actual possession or the certain assurance of future possession must, in the very nature of the case, come to the soul before it can be a favor. The wild eagle, the tiger, and the grizzly bear enjoy favors from God, though they know him not. The favors are experimentally known, not in the character of favors, but as facts. So the infidel, even the atheist and the cannibal, enjoy favors at his hand. The polluted libertine experimentally enjoys the stay of execution and present exemption from the pains of *Gehenna* and the deathless worm. It is the price of the blood of the Lamb, though he knows not or cares not for that precious blood. God has no glory from him; though the multitude of the heavenly host perpetually laud the mercy that spares the wretch. He robs God, and thwarts the divine plan to the extent of the value of his being to the rest of the universe. The "multitude of the heavenly host" could shout "glory to God in the highest," over the fact of a born Savior; for they knew it. The shepherds could join in the heavenly chant when they found him an existing fact. But this they could not have done had they been disappointed in their search where he was said to be. No songs of

praise over angelic delusions, mythical visions, or splendid hallucinations, detected by actual search, would have escaped their lips, but coy expressions of choked regrets and silent woful wonderment. Then they would dismiss the affair as a hallucination of sleepy senses, and fall back and rest in silent hope on the promise repeatedly given through the prophets and corroborated by matter-of-fact wonders and divers miracles through the ages.

No one can give glory to God for matter-of-fact salvation, unless he knows he has it,—or thinks he knows, at least. Therefore a knowledge of a matter-of-fact salvation is an absolute prerequisite to the fulfillment of such sacred commands as these: "Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." (John 16: 24.) "Rejoice evermore. * * In all things give thanks;" and also to a rational apprehension of God's definition of his own spiritual kingdom:—"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink;* but righteousness,† and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 14: 17.)

Thus are we inevitably borne to the conclusion that the fact of salvation and the joy of salvation are inseparable. The fact brings the joy, for the

---

*Does not consist in the means of sensuous enjoyment.
†Holiness. (See Watson's Bib. Dic.)

joy is part of the fact. "The kingdom *is* [in part] *joy* and *peace*." "Ask." When ye "receive, your joy shall be full." "*Rejoice evermore*." How *can* we, under condemnation? You can not; but "the fruit of the Spirit is *joy*." (Gal. 5: 22.) Can we not have the righteousness of God's kingdom without the joy? No; for the kingdom consists of three elements which are inseparable. 1. "Righteousness. 2. Peace. 3. Joy." You can not have one without the other two. But can we not have these elements of the kingdom without being conscious of all? No; for they are fruits of the Spirit, and he will not impart the greatest of all gifts—salvation—when the soul is not in harmony with his invariable plan of "fact, revelation, and glory." Indeed, the soul can not be in the saved state without being in harmony with the divine plan; for to pronounce a sentence of justification on a soul while it is conscious of variance from his plans would be equivalent to self-impeachment by the Holy One, with favoring rebellion against his own government. The soul, then, being in harmony with the divine plans on receipt of the gift of the Holy Ghost, would consent to the item of "divine glory," and cheerfully give praise to God. But how could he praise him for the possession of a thing—salvation—when he was not certain that he had received it? He

could not sincerely. Then a part of the divine plan must be "revelation;" so that he could know and give thanks and "glory." "Do all to the glory of God."

Moreover, the revelation of salvation is, as we have seen in the divine definition of it, *a part of the fact;* therefore the plan, the Executor of the plan,—that is, the Holy Ghost,—the soul receiving the favor, and the fact of the favor, whose value and grandeur and GLORY no tongue or pen of man or golden harp of mighty angel can ever express, all harmonize in a "revelation" of the fact. "A city that is set on a hill can not be hid." When the soul is elevated to the rank of the redeemed, the fact can not be hid. The fact, the revelation, and the glory are inseparable. The angelic hosts shouted, "Glory to God in the highest," over a matter-of-fact Redeemer. So also did the shepherds, when they in fact found him. They found him in a certain *place*, according to angelic direction, and in a certain *moment*, according to philosophical necessity. All other moments having fallen into the grave of the past before the one in which they found him, and none of the future moments yet having come, *that* particular moment was a very definite one. So when the soul is born of God into his heavenly family and moral kingdom of "righteousness, peace, and joy

in the Holy Ghost," the fact occurs in a definite moment, all other moments being past or future, and in the definite locality which it occupies at that definite moment. And it is agreed on all hands that in that moment the soul is filled with Deity,—the Father, Son, and Spirit,—and so with "love, joy, peace, and the hope of eternal glory." All this, it is agreed, commences at the moment of regeneration. There is no dispute among those who believe in regeneration at all as to its instantaneousness. If then "entire sanctification" is, as Mr. Wesley declares, "of a different kind and infinitely greater than any ["change wrought"] before, and than any can conceive till he experience it;" (C. P., page 23) and if it be, as they call it, an "*entire*" fact when it is "wrought" in "this birthday of the Spirit of love in our souls, [which] whenever we attain, will feast our souls with such peace and joy in God as will blot out the remembrance of everything we called peace or joy before" (*Fletcher after Wesley*), in that period when "the Son hath made them free who are thus born of God from that great root of sin and bitterness—pride," (C. P., page 8) have we not a right, in the very nature of things, and according to the essential meaning of their terms, to expect a complete agreement among the "second-work divines, in affirming the instantaneous purification of the

soul, whenever that work occurs? Have we not a right to expect them to declare with one voice, "The 'entire sanctification' of the soul is not a gradual but an instantaneous work?" From the high character which they attribute to the work, viewed in the light of the truths we have just now been contemplating, we certainly have a right to expect their unanimous affirmation of the proposition that "entire sanctification occurs in a moment."

1. The overwhelming joy and peace they speak of, so far above that in regeneration, which we know is matter of instantaneous consciousness, would certainly become a matter of consciousness equally sudden.

2. They tell us "profession is essential to retention." But how can a man honestly profess "entire sanctification" before he knows—or at least thinks he knows—he has it?

3. They tell us, "It must be definitely sought as a specific state." But if it is not obtained at a definite period, how shall we know when to cease seeking it, and commence the profession of it? We might profess falsely by professing too soon, or lose it in the neglect of duty by waiting too long.

The nature of the supposed case demands definiteness. Well, some of their authors have it

definite in all cases. Some have it definite in some cases and indefinite in others. Some have it both definite and indefinite in all cases. "Both instantaneous and progressive." "Entirely sanctified," that is, entirely purified; yet continually undergoing the process of purification! Progressing from complete purity toward complete purity! That would be like a man progressing from the center of a city toward the center of that city, or from the top of a hill toward the top of that hill.

AFFIRMATIVE WITNESSES.

Bishop Castle, after Bishop Hedding, says, "Regeneration is the beginning of purification: entire sanctification is the finishing of that work." (*Tel., June* 19, 1878.)

Again he says, "Sanctification is soul-health. It is that moral condition of things in which the spiritual man matures or attains 'unto a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.' Sanctification is God's moral training, treatment, or care of the life begotten by regeneration—its perfect health." (*Tel., Sept.* 11, 1878.)

These are clear and definite statements, and would lead us to the conclusion that there comes a moment when the work of the soul's purification is made perfect; when it is improved to a state of

"purification finished" and "soul-health perfected." This can not easily be misunderstood. When the purification of a soul is finished, it is perfect and can not be improved; and when the "soul's health is perfect" it can be no healthier; there can be no improvement of its health. The lucky moment is said to be the moment of "sanctification."

Dr. Wood, in speaking of "inbred sin," says, "Its removal is an *instantaneous* and not a *gradual* work. The preparation for its extirpation may be gradual, but its expulsion and the reception of a purified state are instantaneous." (P. L., page 5, 8.)

Mr. Wesley says, "As to manner, I believe this perfection is always wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith; consequently in an instant." Again he says, "To talk of this work as being gradual, would be *nonsense*, as much as if we talked of gradual justification." (P. L., page 65.) Here perfection is accomplished in a moment. And "it would be talking nonsense to talk of this work as being gradual." This is doubtless correct; and yet we shall soon hear Mr. Wesley talking just such "nonsense."

Dr. Richard Watson says, "We have already spoken of justification, adoption, regeneration, and the witness of the Spirit, and we proceed to

another as distinctly marked and as graciously promised in the Holy Scriptures; this is the entire sanctification or the perfected holiness of believers. * * * That a distinction exists between a regenerate state and a state of entire and perfect holiness, will be generally allowed. * * It must be concluded that the entire sanctification of the soul and its complete renewal in holiness, must take place in this world. * * * He who has a true faith in Christ is freed from sin." (*Institutes in one Vol., pages* 611, 612.)

In these and many other words, Dr. Watson taught the doctrine of present, entire freedom from sin and maturity in complete holiness. Indeed, the sentence last quoted implies that every regenerate soul "is freed from sin," unless it be assumed—what no one claims—that the soul may be regenerated without "a true faith in Christ;" for the doctor emphatically says, "He who has a true faith in Christ IS FREED FROM SIN." Every soul must have a true faith in Christ before conversion. And this "true faith in Christ," the doctor says, insures present freedom from sin. And freedom from sin is inseparably connected with holiness, and therefore may, with propriety, be considered identical with holiness. And the state of holiness is the highest possible moral state any being can attain. Therefore Dr. Watson un-

equivocally teaches, by his terms, the doctrine of Christian perfection in regeneration, though he also teaches the contrary. Yet we see that he labors to teach that "the entire sanctification of the soul and its complete renewal in holiness must take place in this world." This is sharply definite. It not only teaches that holiness is attainable in this life, but that this "complete renewal in holiness" is accomplished at the moment of sanctification. No language can fix an event at a certain point of time more definitely than the doctor fixes the "completeness of the soul in holiness." And yet we shall find him placing the soul's moral improvement a little farther in the abyss of indefiniteness than any finite imagination can penetrate. Let us now see if we can not induce all these divines to come over to the other side of this question, "*Is the work of purification accomplished instantaneously?*" and testify as

NEGATIVE WITNESSES.

We will have Bishop Castle and Dr. Watson together. The bishop uses the doctor's language as the vehicle of his ideas, and so makes it his own. After Dr. Watson, Bishop Castle says "that the regeneration which accompanies justification is a large approach to this state of perfect

holiness, and that all dying to sin, and all growth in grace, advances us nearer to this point of *entire sanctity* is so obvious that there can be no reasonable dispute." (*C. in Tel., Nov.* 1878, *and Inst. in I. Vol., page* 612.)

This language unmistakably teaches that the process of purification may proceed gradually. Mr. Wesley calls this "talking *nonsense*." These divines are pretty hard with one another, yet they probably mean nothing harmful by it.

Again Bishop Castle says, "PERFECTION OF DEGREE IS NEVER ATTAINABLE." (*Tel., Oct.* 22, 1879.) Here we have it in a nut-shell. No one ever claimed perfection in anything excepting only moral purity. And this whole discussion relates to moral purity. The bishop was here discussing the topic of moral purity. And he tells us that "perfection of degree is *never* attainable." This fixes the matter for time and eternity. According to this no one ever need expect deliverance from moral pollution, neither in this world nor in the world to come. Has the bishop forgotten his former testimony, in which he said, "Sanctification is soul-health. It is that moral condition of things in which the spiritual man matures or attains unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. * * * It is perfect health."

What does he mean? Is there perfection of degree in Christ? Certainly. Well, the bishop told us that "sanctification brings the soul to the fullness of Christ." If Christ is morally perfect, perfect in the degree of his moral purity, then, according to the bishop's former testimony, the soul's purity becomes also perfect in the degree of its moral purity at the moment of "entire sanctification." But, according to his later testimony, "PERFECTION OF DEGREE IS NEVER ATTAINABLE." When he penned this testimony he was doubtless thinking of Dr. Watson's language of precisely the same import where the doctor says, "The *degree* of every virtue implanted by grace is not limited, but advances and grows in the living Christian through life, and through eternity also." (Inst., page 613.)

This declaration, from the pen of this eminent divine, is possibly true in every item excepting the particular item which he had and which we have under discussion; namely, the item of moral purity, freedom from sin, freedom from moral pollution. But if it be true of this item, then salvation has never yet come to this world, and the human family is yet without a Savior.

1. The doctor says, "The degree of EVERY VIRTUE implanted by grace advances and grows through eternity."

2. If moral purity is not a virtue, then there is no virtue. It is the center and sum of all virtues.

3. If it is not implanted by grace, then there is no grace. We surely have no independent virtue. "By grace are ye saved." "Not by works of righteousness which we have done. * * He saved us by the washing of regeneration." "It is the gift of God." (Eph. 2 : 8.) What is the gift of God? Salvation. Does salvation embrace moral purity? Certainly. "He shall save his people from their sins," said an angel to his mother. "Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." (Ps. 51 : 7.) "Now ye are clean," said Jesus to the eleven, after Judas had gone out from the supper.

4. "Was their cleanness of such a character as that it could 'grow through eternity?'" According to Dr. Watson's later testimony it could "advance and grow" forever.

5. The impure can be purified only by the removal of pollution. Hence "*the degree*" of purity can only "advance and grow" by the continued removal of pollution or uncleanness. But pollution can not be removed where there is none.

6. If, then, a thing be in such a condition as to be susceptible of cleansing during a year, it will not, of course, be clean till the year is ended. If

its purity can be improving in the best of hands, and under the best process during ten years, it can not be pure till the ten years are ended. If a soul can be ten millions of years under the best process of purification, it will not be pure till the ten millions of years are ended. If the soul's purity may continue under the best purifying process of an omnipotent Hand through eternity, it will not, of course, be cured till eternity is ended. When will that be? God himself can see no end to eternity; for there is none,—there will be none. If then Bishop Castle and Dr. Watson be correct in their statements, that "perfection of *degree* is never attainable," and "the degree of every virtue may advance and grow through eternity," then we are borne to the following conclusions:

1. Salvation from sin has never yet reached our planet. 2. If any soul enters heaven on leaving this world, no finite mind can comprehend nor tongue express the amount and degree of moral pollution in heaven. 3. The period of heaven's purity will never arrive. 4. The psalmist knew nothing about theology when he offered the prayer, "Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." 5. Jesus was an impostor, or a novice in theology when he said, "Now ye are clean through the words which I have spoken unto you." 6. It was an incorrect statement which was made in heaven,

"These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them WHITE in the blood of the Lamb." (Rev. 7: 14.)

7. There can be no propriety in the talk of these garrulous "second-work" theologians about "entire sanctification," "*entire* sanctity," "perfect holiness," "entire and perfect holiness," "full salvation," "perfectly cleansed," "cleansed through and through," and so on and on and on.

The reader clearly sees that Castle and Watson are heavy witnesses against Castle and Watson. We must hasten.

Mr. Wesley says, "There is no perfection which does not admit of a continual increase." (C. P., page 4.) Again he says, "When does inward sanctification begin? *Ans.* In the moment a man is justified. Yet sin remains in him; yea, the seed of sin, till he is sanctified throughout. *From that time a believer* GRADUALLY DIES TO SIN *and grows in grace.*" (C. P., page 11.)

Does Mr. Wesley *mean* gradually when he *says* "gradually?" Or does he mean instantaneous? Has he forgotten that when we last heard him he said, "To talk of this work being gradual would be nonsense?"

Again he says, "But is not this the case of all that are justified? Do they not *gradually* die to sin and grow in grace till at, or perhaps a little

before death God perfects them in love? *Ans.* I believe this is the case of most, but not all. God usually gives a considerable *time* for men to receive *light*, to grow in grace, to *do and suffer* his will, before they are either justified* or sanctified. But he does not invariably† adhere to this. Sometimes he cuts short his work. He does the work of many years in a few weeks, perhaps in a week, a day, an hour. He justifies, or sanctifies both those who have *done or suffered* nothing, and who have not had *time* for a gradual growth, either in *light*¶ *or grace.* It need not, therefore, be affirmed over and over, and proved by forty texts of scripture, either that most men are perfect in love at *last*, that there is a gradual work of God in the soul, or that, generally speaking, it is a *long* time, even many years, before sin is destroyed. All this we know. But we know likewise that God *may*, with man's good leave, *cut short his work*, in whatever degree he pleases, and do the usual work of many years in a moment.¶ He does so in many instances."** (C. P., page 39.)

Thus Mr. Wesley keeps on reiterating what he

---

*Can the unconverted do God's will? "The carnal mind is enmity against God." (Paul.) "Ye can not serve the Lord." (Joshua.)

†God's ways are not variable.

¶Mr. Wesley has quite forgotten that so sudden a communication of light would cause "the soul to fail before him, and the spirit which he had made." See "4 Contradiction"—"Only reason they assign," &c.

*This is like Mr. Hoke's surrender.

calls "nonsense." Not only so; but he shows us that in most cases Christians spend a whole life-time in the "polluted, merely regenerate" state. Then God comes, without any conditions being met on their part, and cuts short "the usual work of years in a moment." Now the question comes upon us irresistibly, Why does he not "cut short the work in a moment" in every case? If he can justly do so unconditionally in one or "in *many* cases," why can he not, on the same ground, in all? Once Mr. Wesley told us that so sudden a transition from darkness to light would crush the soul; but now he sees that it is a mistake. This difficulty being out of the way, and no other in the way, and it being "the will of God, even your sanctification,"—and a sanctified man certainly is more useful in the world than an unsanctified one,—and the work can be unconditionally done in *all* cases with the same regard to righteous government that is required in "many," there can be no good reason assigned why God should not "cut short the usual work of many years in a moment" for every convert (or even for the common sinner), especially since we are told that every regenerate soul "*pants* after holiness," and God has declared that all such "shall be filled."

Here, then, we see that Mr. Wesley contradicts himself by teaching what he elsewhere calls "non-

sense." He contradicts his assigned reason why God withheld—as he believed—the requisite light from the convert to lead him to sanctification, contradicts the Bible and his own general teaching on the conditionality of salvation, and finally contradicts his whole "second-work" theory and doctrine, and makes a formal surrender by saying, "God does in many instances the usual work of many years in a moment." Doubtless his object in making this uncomely, contradictory, anti-Arminian flounder and complete surrender was to ingratiate his doctrine, by compromise, with its opposers, and save it from reproach among those whose pious, sainted friends never professed or even heard of the "second-work" doctrine.

6. Contradiction. On the manner and nature of the change wrought in sanctification.

1. On the MANNER of the change we shall find Messrs. Wesley, Wood, Castle, and Paul agreeing against Wesley, Wood, Castle, and the entire school of "second-work" theologians.*

1. Mr. Wood and Mr. Wesley testify with the same words, as follows: "The *body of sin*, the *carnal mind*, must be *destroyed;* the old man must be slain, or we *can not* put on the new man, which is

*The item of consecration belongs here; but we have already noticed this in "2 Contradiction."

created after God (or which is the image of God), in righteousness and true holiness." (Perfect Love, pages 64, 65.)

This language indicates unmistakably that (1) "the body of sin" must be entirely destroyed, the carnal mind slain before the new man can be put on; (2) that therefore whenever the new man is put on it is conclusive evidence that "the body of sin, the carnal mind," *is* destroyed. If the destruction of the old *must* precede the putting on of the new, as these two divines declare, then the actual putting on of the new is all-sufficient evidence that the old has actually been slain and destroyed. Here these divines have beautifully agreed with Paul when he says, "They that are Christ's *have crucified* the flesh with the affections and lusts." (Gal. 5 : 24.)

Commenting on a similar scripture, in another place, Mr. Wesley says, "'Christ liveth in me,' and, 'I live not,' are *inseparably* connected." (C. P., page 6.) So far these divines and Paul beautifully agree.

2. These divines, in perfect harmony with Paul, clearly show us that the new man is put on in conversion.

Bishop Castle makes this very clear when he says, "Every feature of the divine nature or image is imparted to the child of grace at regenera-

tion. Every element of the man in Christ* Jesus may be found in the babe in Christ." (*Tel., June* 19, 1878.) "*Every* feature of the divine image" surely embraces the entire image.

Mr. Wesley makes the blessed fact still plainer, if possible. He says, "The state of the justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious. He is born again, * * a child of God, * * an heir of the kingdom of heaven. The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keepeth his heart and mind in Christ Jesus. His very body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and a habitation of God. * * He is *created* anew in Christ Jesus; he is *washed;* he is sanctified. His heart is purified. He is cleansed from corruption. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him." (*Sermons, Vol. I., page* 109.)

Notice carefully, "He IS CREATED ANEW IN CHRIST JESUS." This is what Messrs. Wood and Wesley told us can not be prior to the utter destruction of the old man, the body of sin, the carnal mind. All right. So Paul says. Then he is purified and made anew. Still further he says, "He is *washed;* he is SANCTIFIED. His heart IS PURIFIED. He is CLEANSED FROM CORRUPTION." All right. So says the sacred word. This also harmonizes with Mr.

---

*Is the element of moral purity found in "the man in Christ Jesus?" Yes; "entirely sanctified."

Wesley's language when he says, "'Christ liveth in me,' and, 'I live not,' are inseparably connected."

3. It is agreed on all hands that Christ comes in and takes possession of the soul at the moment of conversion.

4. Yet all these "second-work" divines, and all their followers, most tenaciously hold, in direct contradiction of the statements above, that the carnal mind is not destroyed nor the soul purified in regeneration. We can scarcely believe that sane men would so directly contradict themselves under *any* circumstances, especially when treating the awfully solemn subject under review.

Mr. Wood after Mr. Wesley says, "But if there be no such *second* change, if there be no instantaneous deliverance *after* justification, then we must remain full of sin till death." Again, "But it is seldom long before they [the regenerate] are undeceived, finding that sin was only *suspended*, not *destroyed*. Temptations return and sin revives, showing that it was *stunned* before, and *not* destroyed." (P. L., pages 60, 61.)

Mr. Wesley, speaking of the same class of persons, says, "Now they see all the hidden abominations there, the depth of pride, self-will, and hell, yet having the witness in themselves, 'Thou art an heir of God, a joint heir with Christ." C. P., page 10.)

Bishop Castle says, "Now back of all this actual, outward life-sin there is resident a natural, inherent, inbred corruption that remains unchanged by the process of purification from acquired impurity. * * It is not sin proper, in the sense of 'sin is the transgression of the law,' but it is sin in the sense that 'all unrighteousness is sin.'" (*Tel.*, *June* 12, 1878.) This the thing that, according to the bishop's view, made the whole church at Corinth so bad that "the apostle would say that they were sinful in thought, in word, and in deed," and that produces in the bishop's lower order of Christians the conduct which arouses him to say, "The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy. * * The lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life is not of the Father, but is of the world. Is there no seeking of fleshly gratification, no sensual and impure desires, no love of parade, gaudy dress, and costly decoration among Christian people; no seeking of honorable distinction and loud boastings of office and position among Christian men, and even ministers of the word? Whence do these come but from the impurity that yet reigns within? Indeed, this is so apparent that to pause for reasoning upon it is but to contradict a judgment that has ripened into unquestioned certainty." (*Tel.*, *June* 19, 1878.) Pretty hard cases for world's people these

are; but they pass among these charitable "holiness people" for second-rate Christians.

Professor Upham says, "They do not believe, certainly not as they should do, because they have not fully consecrated themselves to God. In other words, they continue to indulge in some known sins." (Int. Li., pages 28, 29,)

We need not further enumerate nor quote these authors. They unanimously hold, in contradiction to God's word, and in many instances self-contradiction, that the old man lives in the Christian heart and pollutes it; or, in other terms, that the old carnal pollution still remains in the soul, and continues his pernicious struggles there after the soul has been "created anew in Christ Jesus." Paul says, "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts." These authors first clap their hands and shout, "That is so; and it is a glorious work." Afterward, coming to a recollection of the necessity of something for "second work" to do, they commence talking about "the hidden abominations, the depth of pride, self-will, sensuality, pride, ambition, bombast, the works of the devil, and hell," in the soul that "is washed, sanctified, purified, and hath opened in it the kingdom of heaven."

How can we call such anything better than mixed theology?

2. On the NATURE of the change wrought in the supposed second work we shall find a woful contradiction.

1. Many of these divines tell us that there is nothing new obtained in the "second work," but only an increase of what was begun in conversion. Bishop Castle's *Highway of Holiness*, April, 1879, says, "Every one who is reasonably well versed in the theory of entire sanctification, as received by us, knows that the advocates of holiness do not uphold a second birth, but a *blessing after the birth*." (Page 91.)

This brings it down to a smaller magnitude than they generally attach to the imaginary, wonderful thing. Yet they generally consider it in the light of simply an increase of the same thing.

2. But in this they vastly differ from their father, Mr. Wesley. He, as we have seen in copious quotations, places a higher estimate and pronounces a higher eulogium on the moral condition and character acquired in regeneration than most of them do; perhaps than they all do. And yet he doubtless excels them all in drawing a contrast between the regenerate soul and the perfected soul, according to his view of the change that brings it to perfection.

Mr. Wesley says, "In that instant he lives the full life of love. And as the change undergone

when the body dies is of a different kind and infinitely greater than any we had known before, yea, such as till then it is impossible to conceive; so the change wrought when the soul dies to sin is of a different kind and infinitely greater than any before, and than any can conceive till he experience it." (C. P., page 23.)

"*Of a* DIFFERENT KIND and *infinitely* greater." Not the same thing at all; nor will the other bear any comparison. The finite bears no comparison with the infinite. But did Mr. Wesley really mean anything like this? My business is not to tell you what he meant, but to place before you his utterances, and allow you the pleasure of determining from his words what he meant, if you can, or at least deciding whether you have sufficient reason to conclude that *he* had a definite opinion as to what he meant. I know this, however, that he called it, as we have seen, a *birth*. I know, too, that his admiring pupil, Dr. Fletcher, after Mr. Wesley, said, "This birthday of the Spirit of love in our souls, whenever we attain, will feast our souls with such peace and joy in God as will blot out the remembrance of everything that we called peace or joy before." (*Scott's Chris. Perf., page* 63.) Of course, this would lead us to the conclusion that it is another moral or spiritual birth. But this is nothing "of a differ-

ent kind from anything before," though it would certainly be a very great affair,—first be born anew, and then to be born still newer. But the re-regenerating agent is supposed to be the same in both cases; so also the subject. And the general understanding appears to be that the work or process is purely of a moral character in both cases. How, then, can the doctor reach the opinion that it is "of a different kind?" This is especially mysterious when we consider it in connection with the definition which Mr. Wesley gives of the state into which the change, as he supposes, brings the soul. He defines it thus: "Christian perfection is pure love filling the heart and governing all the words and actions. * * Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life, this is the whole of Christian perfection." (C. P., page 22.) Love is certainly a moral act, quality, or element. God is love. And this same Mr. Wesley teaches us that God commences to reign in the heart at the moment of conversion when he tells us, of the convert, "He is a child of God, a member of Christ. The peace of God, that passeth all understanding, keepeth his heart and mind in Christ Jesus. His very body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and a habitation of God. He is created anew in Christ Jesus; he is washed; he is sanctified. His heart is purified by faith; he is clean from the corrup-

tion that is in the world. The LOVE OF GOD IS SHED ABROAD IN HIS HEART *by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him. * * He keepeth the commandments of God, and doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight,* so exercising himself as to have a conscience void of offense toward God and toward man; and he has power both over outward and inward sin, even from the moment of his justification." (*Sermons, Vol. I., page* 109.)

Unless we suppose God and Beelzebub reigning in peaceful concert, unless we suppose there can be communion between light and darkness, and sweet harmony between Christ and Belial, we can not imagine a soul in the moral state here presented to our view by Mr. Wesley without the love—the *pure* love—of God "reigning alone in the heart and life." God has none but pure love. This Mr. Wesley, in perfect harmony with Paul, declares is shed abroad in the heart at the moment of conversion. The Holy Ghost is given him. He is a temple of God. He keepeth his commandments, &c. Whenever a soul does this, God reigns in that soul. God's commandments require perfection of moral character. They can not be kept without it. How, then, can Mr. Wesley imagine that the soul acquires a state of a *different kind* at the time of his imaginary second re-birth? Thus we see that there is a yawning disparity be-

tween Mr. Wesley's views and very many of his pupils. Not only so; but there is a vast inconsistency between his definition of Christian perfection and his wild declaration that "the change wrought when the soul dies to sin is of a different kind" from that wrought in regeneration. His statements are so thoroughly inconsistent and contradictory that we can not receive them at all, only as we see they agree with the sacred word. He is not a safe and reliable teacher in theology. We must look at God's word for ourselves, *think* for ourselves, and constantly beg of the eternal Source of all light, life, and truth to quicken our understanding and lead us in a plain path. These contradictory divines will lead us into unfathomable mists and darkness if we undertake to follow them. Blessed Redeemer, guide our erring feet, and save us from the mazes of the mixed theology. Amen.

7. Contradiction. On the conditionality or fatality of full salvation.

The sacred Scriptures clearly teach the conditionality of salvation. When a frightened jailor cries out, "What shall I do to be saved?" we never hear an inspired teacher saying, "Hold, sir, just be quiet; you can not be lost. All men will finally be happy in heaven." No such language ever

came from inspired lips or pen. They answer such interrogatories on this wise: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Paul.) "He will save you because you trust in him." (David.) "Repent and believe the gospel." "By grace are ye saved through faith." "He that believeth not shall be damned." "If thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever."* Such is the tenor of God's word. There is no arbitrary, unconditional salvation. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?"† There are four imaginable methods, on one of which the divine government may be imagined to proceed with respect to the lost soul: 1. To save all unconditionally; 2. two reject all unconditionally; 3. to save a part and reject the rest, unconditionally; or, 4. to save conditionally all who comply, and reject the rest for non-compliance.

1. If God should adopt the plan of saving¶ all unconditionally he would thereby offer the highest imaginable premium on perpetual rebellion. A holy being never can do this. He could

*I. Chron. 28: 9.

†Ezekiel 33: 11.

¶Unconditional recovery out of pollution can not be imagined.

not keep a heaven, nor make any really happy. All would be perpetually apprehensive of the inauguration of some disastrous policy or project to run uncontrolled in a universe where rebellion and crime were at a premium. Moreover, some would have to be saved contrary to their will, which is absurd. Moral qualities can not be forced. Harmony among rational beings must be voluntary. Forced harmony of wills and volitions can not be imagined. Such an idea as plurality of wills harmonized under pressure of coercion can not be cogitated. No mind can think it. The essential nature of will is the power of self-decision or self-determination—choice. There can be no self-determination or choice under coercion. A forced voluntary act can not occur.

Salvation does not consist in locality. Residence in heaven without a heart wedded to holiness would not be salvation; and holiness is necessarily a vouluntary state of soul. No mechanism can ever beget holiness in a soul without its own voluntary choice and concurrence.

2. To reject all unconditionally would render all investigation, inquiry, reasoning, conclusion, and action utterly nugatory and useless.

3. If God should propose to save some unconditionally and rejects others unconditionally, then (1) there would meet him the same insurmounta-

ble difficulties as in undertaking to save *all* unconditionally. (2) It would be utterly useless for any finite being to concern himself about the matter of salvation in any sense, because he could in no wise affect his own case or that of any other one, for good or for ill. (3) The universe would be shocked from center to circumference with the contemplation of God's partiality. If he could unconditionally, arbitrarily save one, he could do so with all. If he allow one soul to be lost which he could have saved, his goodness stands impeached. Infinite goodness does all the good it can. God's might has no mechanical limit; but it is constantly limited by the boundary of moral propriety. Moral excellency and beauty never pass that; never *can*, and continue the same.*

The conditionality of salvation is so obvious that all authors on "second work" recognize it.

Consecration and faith† are the conditions upon which they all claim the inestimable gift is suspended. Consecration and trust are doubtless identical, when theologically considered. Submission, consecration, and trust mutually involve each other. These theologians all declare that

---

*"He could there do no mighty work," &c. (Mark 6:5.) Why not? Unbelief bounded propriety.

†Upham.

justification and sanctification are conditioned on consecration and faith.*

Mr. Wesley says, "He, therefore, who liveth in these Christians hath purified their hearts by faith. * * God hath now laid the ax unto the root of the tree, purifying their hearts by faith. (C. P., pages 6, 8.)

Dr. Wood says, "There is no sanctification without entire consecration. Consecration, which is your work, * * is not sanctification; but it invariably precedes it, and ever afterward accompanies it. * * You must consecrate yourself in *detail*, and get every *item* upon the altar. In order to grasp the whole you must take in the items.† * * The consecration must be perfect before the offering will be received. God will have a thorough work, and purity will never be given or retained but on condition of *entire*, *universal*, *unconditional* abandonment of all sin, and acceptance and approval of all the will of God." (P. L., page 79.)

---

*Faith and consecration are the order when the two ideas are employed. Trust is the better word.

†A full consecration of the soul must, as we have seen, precede conversion in all cases. This self-consecration necessarily includes *all* possessions, as you own a man's property if you own the man, whether all the items are counted or not, A man's possessions go with his person. Afterward many take back small items. God is displeased with breach of contract and self-rule; that is, rebellion. The soul tries to believe all is well, drags along in cold forms, becomes alarmed, commences God's service in earnest, itemizes the offering, regains salvation, and (if under second-work instruction) calls it "THE SECOND WORK," while God calls it "*the first work and first love.*" (See Rev. 2: 4, 5.)

Bishop Castle says, "To obtain pardon the sinner must cease from his rebellion, and possess the spirit of full and complete loyalty to the government," etc. Again he says, "The fact is, Christ is only unto his people what they by faith in every instance make him." *Tel. April* 30, 1879.)

We need not quote further. They all agree, at one time or another, in affirming the conditionality of salvation in all its phases. But let us now see whether they all agree with themselves or not. It may be that we shall find them all agreeing to disagree with *all.*

1. They all agree that "without holiness no man shall see God."

2. They all agree that an unholy man—that is, their unholy "merely justified" man, "full of sin and hell,"—has a first-class title to heaven.

3. They all agree that he will be sure to get there, unless he backslides before death. Bishop Castle says, "A sister once said to me, 'I do not profess sanctification. If I were to die would I be saved?' 'Certainly,' I said, 'if you maintain your justification.'" (*Tel.*, *June* 26, 1878.) Again he says, "There is quite a difference between having a title to an inheritance and being fitted for actual entrance upon that inheritance. 'But,' says one, 'where will one go if he dies in simply a justified state?' To heaven, to be sure, as in

the case of the child. God will never turn innocence away." (*Tel.*, *Jan.* 22, 1879.)

Dr. Wood after Dr. Fletcher, speaking of the "merely regenerate" soul, says, "And were he to die at midnight, before midnight God would certainly bring him to Christian perfection, or bring Christian perfection to him." (P. L., page 320.)

Mr. Wesley says, "God usually gives a considerable *time* for men to receive *light* to grow in *grace, to do and suffer* his will, before they are either justified or sanctified.* But he does not invariably adhere to this. Sometimes he cuts short his work. He does the work of many years in a few weeks, perhaps in a week, a day, an hour. He justifies, or sanctifies, both those who have *done or* suffered nothing, and who have not had *time* for a gradual growth, either in *light or grace.* And *may he not do what he will with his own?* Is thine eye evil because he is good? It need not, therefore, be affirmed over and over, and proved by forty texts of scripture, either that most men are perfect in love at *last*, that there is a *gradual work* of God in the soul, or that, generally speaking, it is a *long time*, even many years, before sin is destroyed. All this we know. But

*Here are two remarkable assumptions: 1. That man can grow in grace while in rebellion against God. 2. That an unconverted soul can do the will of God, and often does so.

we know likewise that God *may*, with man's good leave, *cut short his work*, in whatever degree he pleases, and do the usual work of many years in a moment. He does so in many instances." (C. P., page 39.)

1. Here we have before us the doctrine that in some instances God requires men to "*do and suffer* his will" for many years before he is pleased to come and give them clean hearts.

2. That in many instances he *cuts short his work*, and does the usual work of many years in a moment, without regard to the rule of "giving considerable *time* for men to receive *light* to grow in grace, to do and suffer his will."

3. Here is a representation of an arbitrary government, in which no uniformity is observed in regard to conditions of salvation. Some are required to meet certain conditions, but many are not. And some do not get the conditioned blessing even when they meet the conditions.

4. Thus it appears that salvation, according to these divines, is not uniformly conditioned, only in some cases. Evidently these divines are blessed with very poor memories, or else they have very little regard for consistency. At one time they tell us that God invariably requires a thoroughly itemized, complete consecration, or *doing and suffering* his will for many years before he is pleased

to bestow the conditioned salvation. At another time they have him "*cutting short* the usual work of many years in a moment," without regard to conditions of any kind. Surely such theology is more than moderately *mixed.*

It is no relief to the case to say that Mr. Wesley throws in the explanatory clause, "By man's good leave;" for by it the arbitrariness is made more distinctly obvious. It compels the inquiry, "Does God carry on the work of moral improvement—purification—in the hearts of many, through a course of "many years," arbitrarily and regardless of "their good leave?" Or, supposing they give "their good leave," then does he yet withhold the blessing through the many long years in which they are "*doing and suffering* his will," while in some arbitrarily chosen cases "he *cuts short* the work of many years in a moment, without any reason excepting that he *chooses* to do for some, "with their good leave," simply what he will not do for others, with not only "their good leave," but also with their many good long years of "*doing and suffering* his will?" It will not do now to talk about withholding the light through these years, "lest the soul should fail before him, and the spirit which he had made;" for this item of theology has now become obsolete with Mr. Wesley, since he has found out that God

can, and "in many instances *does* cut short the usual work of many years in a moment."

Will the reader do some calm, steady, prayerful thinking while we track up these divines to see just how they came to see the absolute necessity of applying the doctrine of unconditional salvation to adults under the light of the gospel. Their nuptials with the double moral birth doctrine befogged them and led them away.

1. They know that every justified soul is a child of God, born into his family.

2. They know that all God's children are in possession of a good title—even a joint title with Christ—to an inheritance in heaven.

3. They know that it will never do to say that the child of God, dying in the justified state, can miss that blessed abode. This would be too troublesome to manage.

4. Yet it will not do to admit that the "merely regenerate" soul is fit for heaven; for this would leave no necessity for "second work," and so lay their cause in hopeless ruin.

5. It is undeniably true that multitudes have lived many years in the consistent, undisputed, and indisputable profession of salvation, and died without professing the second work. Others have died in a very short time after conversion without the second work.

6. Here, then, are two classes of cases who, according to these divines, left the world bearing a first-class title to the glorious mansions in heaven, and yet without the fitness to enjoy them.

7. Here, now, is a theological emergency. These souls are to be sent to heaven under peculiar circumstances. (1) Their title dare not be questioned, admitting that they were children of God, seeing Paul declare, "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." (Rom. 8: 17.) (2) If their purity and fitness for heaven be acknowledged, then it will never do again to say, "But if there be no such second change, if there be no instantaneous deliverance *after* justification, if there be none but a gradual work, then we must be content, as best we can, to remain ful of sin to death." (3) It is too late when the soul is crossing the boundary between time and eternity to apply Dr. Wood's rule of an itemized consecration in order to obtain the "second work," especially when the soul is in "blissful ignorance" of any such necessity. The doctor says, "You must consecrate yourself in *detail*, and get every *item* on the altar. In order to grasp the *whole*, you must take in the *items*. * * The consecration must be perfect before the offering will be received." But it is too late to apply this rule when the soul is in the act of passing into the unseen.

What is to be done for these dying millions with their titles to heaven and their moral fitness for hell?*

One of four things must be done: (1) Millions of souls in possession of number one titles to mansions in heaven must be sent to hell; (2) God must set aside his rule requiring holiness as a moral fitness for heaven; (3) the conditionality of sanctification—that is, moral purity,—must be set aside in such cases, and the work accomplished by the Holy One *unconditionally*, for adults as well as for infants; or, (4) the double moral birth doctrine must fall to rise no more.

But it will never do to say that souls are sent to hell in possession of warranty titles to seats in heaven. Neither will it do to say that polluted souls, full of pride, self-will, lasciviousness and envy, carnal, sold under sin, are admitted into the courts of glory, and constitute a considerable percentage of the population there. It is too late for a man to take an inventory of his possessions and make out an infallibly correct list of the items to be consecrated, and consecrate them and himself specifically for consecration as a distinct and separate work, when he is dying, especially if he knows

*"Now they see all the hidden abominations there, the depth of pride, self-will, and hell, yet having the witness in themselves, 'Thou art an heir of God, a joint heir with Christ.'" (Christian Perfection, by John Wesley, page 10.)

nothing of such necessity. In fact, it is too late to comply with conditions of any sort, for any purpose.

But the conditionality of full salvation must therefore be set aside, or the second-work theory must fall. They can not both stand in these millions of cases before us. If one is affirmed the other must fall.

How does Mr. Wesley dispose of this awfully critical case, and provide for the theological emergency? Well, he simply takes his ingenious theological pen, steps over into the soil of the rigid fatalist, shakes hands with the natives there, looks back on the fair fields of Arminius with a wistful stare, and petulantly says, "And *may he not do what he will with his own? Is thine eye evil because he is good?* It need not therefore be affirmed over and over, and proved by forty texts of scripture, either that most men are perfect in love at *last*, &c. All this we know. But we know likewise that God *may*, with man's good leave, *cut short his work*, in whatever degree he pleases, and do the usual work of many years in a moment. *He does so in many instances.*"

Thus these divines are obliged to affirm and do affirm the *unconditional salvation* of adults under the light of the gospel. At one time Bishop Castle says, "The fact is, Christ is only unto his peo-

ple what they by faith in *every* instance *make* him." Again he says, "Where will one go if he dies in simply a justified state? To heaven, to be sure, as in the case of the child."* Dr. Wood requires a perfectly itemized consecration of all before the sacrifice can be accepted. Yet Mr. Wesley finds that this rule must be suspended in the case of the great majority of Christians.

So go their contradictions of the Bible and of one another. Finally, each one contradicts *all*, himself included. Nine tenths of their followers have but a very faint idea of the items included in their chosen theory. This fact nerves me with patient solicitude to drag out the nauseating items that must be dragged out in this review. But we must now take our leave of this part of our subject.

OBJECTION 24.

IT HAS NO SUPPORT IN THE SACRED SCRIPTURES WHERE ITS FRIENDS PRETEND TO FIND IT.

1. SCRIPTURE.—*Rom.* 7: 14–25.

"For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent

*If God can do the work unconditionally at last why can he not at first? Ah, that would kill our pet. That would *never* do.

unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.†"*

[Let us append the next two verses for convenience; also the ninth verse of the same chapter.] "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. * * * But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man

---

*Our judgment and conscience always approve the law of God who made both law and conscience.

†I have quoted *all*, for fairness and convenience to the Scripture-loving reader. God's word is best.

have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." The Spirit of God is the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth, the Comforter, the Spirit of burning, &c. All the same. He who is destitute of this is not in Christ, nor of Christ—"none of his." Blessed Jesus, dwell in our hearts perpetually through the merits of thy blood. Amen. See also just here another word from Paul: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." (Gal. 5: 24.)

This scripture of our present text (Rom. 7: 14–25) has been claimed in support of their favorite doctrines by two widely opposite schools of theologians. It is a favorite in equally high esteem among Calvinists, who say, "We can never be free from sin in this life," and among double-birth Arminians, holding that "if there be no instantaneous deliverance after justification, we must remain full of sin till death." Here, it is claimed by these two schools, is abundant support of the idea that a man can be, as Bishop Castle worded it, taking the twenty-fifth verse as his specific basis, "half sinner and half Christian." Here these opposite schools fondly embrace one another, and stand on common ground, although they are in their practical working as far apart as noon and night.

As we are not reviewing Calvinists, but the double-birth doctrine, and as we have a rule to present only such testimony as they can not with good grace reject, we shall here present the reasonings of one of their favorite and representative men, the pious Dr. Asa Mahan, ex-president of Oberlin and of Adrian colleges. The president says:

"The bearing of this passage upon the doctrine under consideration [the attainability of moral purity in this life] depends upon the question whether the apostle is describing the state of the *Christian* under the gospel, or of the *sinner* under the law, and acted upon by legal motives only. In favor of this [the former] supposition, two, and only two considerations deserving notice have, to my knowledge, been adduced.

"1. The *present* is here used, 'I am carnal,' &c.; showing, it is said, that the apostle is describing his present character as a Christian.

"In answer to this I remark, (1. That it is perfectly common for the sacred writers to use this tense in describing not only past, but future events. (2. The present tense was demanded in this instance, inasmuch as the design of the apostle is to describe his own, and the state of every other person under the exclusive action of legal motives, in opposition to their state under the

gospel. Under the former he says, 'I am (and of course every other man is) 'carnal, sold' (a bond-slave) 'under sin.' Under the latter, chapter 8: 2, 'I am free from the law of sin and death.' Thus said Whitefield, as a drunkard was reeling before him, 'There is George Whitefield, but for the grace of God.' Supposing the apostle here to be describing his state as a sinner under the law, the present tense is demanded just as much as if he were describing his state as a Christian.

"2. The language used by the apostle in this passage, it is said, is applicable to the Christian only. For example, 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man.' 'That which I do, I allow not.' 'What I hate, that I do,' &c. To this I answer (1. That language equally strong is applied to the sinner in other parts of the Bible. 'And lo, thou *art* unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not.' (Ezekiel 33: 32.) 'Yet they seek me daily, and delight to know my ways, as a nation that did righteousness, and forsook not the ordinance of their God: they ask of me the ordinances of justice; they take delight in approaching to God.' (Isaiah 58: 2.) 'He was a burning and a shining light and ye were willing: for a season to rejoice in his light.' (John 5: 35.)

'Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law.' (Rom. 2: 17, 18.) Many other passages of similar import might be cited. With what propriety, I ask, can the language used in Romans 7, be cited as proof that the sinner can not there be referred to, when language equally strong is so frequently applied to him in other parts of the Bible?

"(2. Precisely similar language was at this time in common use among the heathen, and by them applied to men as sinners. 'He that sins,' says one, 'does not what he would; but what he would not, that he does.' 'I see the good,' says another, 'and approve it, but follow the bad.' 'I have forgotten none of the things about which you admonished me, but, though I have a desire to do them, nature struggles against it.' 'I knew that it was becoming, but me miserable. I could not do it.' Such is the language common with those very heathen converts to whom the apostle was writing, and applied by them to sinners as such. On what principle, I ask, is it asserted that they would understand this language, in opposition to all previous usage, as applicable to the Christian only? We will now consider a few of the reasons in favor of the supposition that the sinner

under the action of legal influences, and not the Christian under the gospel, is the subject of the apostle's remarks in this passage.

"1. It was so understood by the entire primitive church for the first two or three centuries after the epistle was written. This none, I believe, acquainted with the records of the primitive church will deny. Did the entire church, who received the passage directly from the apostle, mistake his meaning?

"2. The supposition that the Christian is here referred to, places what the apostle says of himself, as a Christian, in this passage and elsewhere, in palpable and irreconcilable contradiction to each other. In the state here described, the apostle says of himself,* 'I am carnal, sold under sin,' that is, a bond-slave under the power of sin, as the slave is under the absolute control of his master. We might here ask, Is this the Christian? Again, 'The good that I would,'—that is, approve,—'I do not, but the evil that I would not,—that is, disapprove,—'that I do.' 'I find, then, a law,' an invariable order of sequence,—for such only is law, —'that when I would do good, evil is present with me.' Speaking of himself as a Christian, the apostle says, 'I keep my body under, and bring it into subjection.' Again, 'The life that I now live

*On the supposition that he is speaking of himself.

in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God.' Are these states compatible? Are they one and the same? Again, the Christian is represented in the Bible as 'overcoming the world.' The individual here referred to is invariably overcome by the world. Are these characters identical? Again, in the state here described, the apostle declares himself to be in 'captivity to the law of sin and death.' In chapter 8: 2, he says, that as a Christian he is free from that very law. How can an individual be captive under a law, and be free from that law at one and the same time?

"Once more. In a state here referred to the apostle says, 'I am carnal.' In chapter 8: 9, he declares absolutely that every real Christian is 'not in the flesh,' that is, carnal, 'but in the Spirit.' How can these states be identical?

"3. If the apostle has described the condition of the Christian under the gospel, in the passage under consideration, he has defeated his own object by showing that the gospel is equally important with the law in producing holiness of heart, the opposite of which he designed to show. The law convicts of sin, and then leaves the subject in bondage under sin. What more does the gospel, if the Christian also is 'carnal, sold under sin?'

"Well might the Jews ask, in view of such a presentation of the power of the gospel, What ad-

vantage hath the Christian, and what profit is there in faith in Christ, as far as holiness is concerned? Do the motions of sin, which are by the law, work in my members to bring forth fruit unto death? So is the Christian by the same influence precisely, 'brought into captivity to the law of sin, which is in his members.' Am I in the flesh? The Christian also is carnal. Am I in bondage under the power of sin? The Christian also is a bond-slave, 'sold under sin.' Do I 'approve of things which are more excellent,' and delight to know God and the ordinances of righteousness, and at the same time remain in a state of disobedience to God? The Christian also 'delights in the law of the Lord, after the inward man,' without obeying that law. 'The good that he would, that he does not; but the evil that he would not, that he does.' How could the apostle, by such a train of reasoning as this, convince the Jew that in depending upon the law for sanctification as well as for justification, he was a sinner leaning upon a broken reed, and that the gospel alone not only justifies but sanctifies the sinner?

"4. The apostle, in the passage before us, declares expressly that he refers to his state as a sinner. 'In me, that is in my flesh,' that is, in my carnal, unrenewed state, 'dwelleth no good thing.'

"5. The individual here described is, by the

apostle's own showing, totally depraved. Notwithstanding all the opposition which the law of God and the law of his mind make to sin, he invariably practices it on all occasions and under all circumstances. If such a state does not indicate the entire absense of holiness, nothing can do it. The whole matter is summed up by the apostle in verse twenty-five—'So, then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.' That is, in the language of Professor Stuart, 'While my mind, that is, my reason and conscience, takes part with the law of God, and approves its sanctions, my carnal part obtains the predominance and brings me into a state of condemnation and ruin.'" (*Scriptural Doctrine of Christian Perfection. Discourse III.*)

The double-birth theologians have done what they could to capture the profound Dr. Adam Clarke. Let us therefore hear him on this famous seventh chapter of Romans. His words will surely be acceptable with them since (according to their representations) he is of their school. In his comments on verse fourteen, the doctor says, "'But I am carnal, sold under sin'. * * I believe it is agreed on all hands, that the apostle is here demonstrating the insufficiency of the law, in opposition to the gospel. That by the former is the knowledge, by the latter the cure of sin.

Therefore by I here he can not mean himself nor any Christian believer. If the contrary could be proved, the argument of the apostle would go to demonstrate the insufficiency of the gospel as well as the law.

"It is difficult to conceive how the opinion could have crept into the church or prevailed there, that 'the apostle speaks here of his regenerate state; and that what was in such a state true of himself, must be true of all others in the same state.' This opinion has, most pitifully and most shamefully, not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence and disgraced its character. It requires but little knowledge of the spirit of the gospel and of the scope of this epistle to see that the apostle is here either personating a Jew under the law and without the gospel, or showing what his own state was when he was deeply convinced that by the deeds of the law no man could be justified, and had not as yet heard those blessed words, 'Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost.' (Acts 9: 17.)

"In this and the following verses he states the contrariety between himself or any Jew, while without Christ and the law of God. Of the latter he says, it is spiritual; of the former, I am carnal,

sold under sin. If the carnal man, in opposition to the spiritual, never was a more complete or accurate description given. The expressions in the flesh and after the flesh, in verse five, and in chapter 8: 5, 8, 9, &c., are of the same import with the word carnal in this verse. To be in the flesh, or to be carnally-minded, solely respects the unregenerate. * * Those who are of another opinion, maintain that by the word carnal here the apostle meant that corruption which dwelt in him after his conversion; but this opinion is founded on a very great mistake. * * * Whatever epithets are given to corruption or sin in scripture, opposite epithets are given to grace or holiness. By these different epithets are the unregenerate and regenerate denominated. From all this it follows that the epithet carnal, which is the characteristic designation of an unregenerate man, can not be applied to St. Paul after his conversion; nor indeed to any Christian in that state.

"But the word carnal, though used by the apostle to signify a state of death and enmity against God, is not sufficient to denote all the evil of the state which he is describing; hence he adds, sold under sin. This is one of the strongest expressions which the Spirit of God uses in scripture to describe the full depravity of fallen man. It implies a willing slavery. Ahab had sold himself

to work evil. * * Now if the word carnal, in its strongest sense, had been sufficiently significant of all he meant, why add to this charge another expression still stronger? We must therefore understand the phrase sold under sin as implying that the soul was employed in the drudgery of sin; that it was sold over to this service, and had no power to disobey this tyrant until it was redeemed by another. And if a man be actually sold to another, and he acquiesce in the deed, then he becomes the legal property of that other person. This state of bondage was well known to the Romans. The sale of slaves they saw daily, and could not misunderstand the emphatical sense of this expression. Sin is here represented as a person; and the apostle compares the dominion which sin has over the man in question to that of a master over his legal slave. Universally through the Scriptures man is said to be in a state of bondage to sin until the Son of God makes him free; but in no part of the sacred writings is it ever said that the children of God are sold under sin. Christ came to deliver the lawful captive, and take away the prey from the mighty. Whom the Son maketh free, they are free indeed. Then they yield not up their members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; for sin shall not have the dominion over them, because the law of the Spirit

of life in Christ Jesus has made them free from the law of sin and death. (Chap. 6 : 13, 14, and 8 : 2.) * * Verse 15—'For that which I do I allow not,' &c. * * What I am continually laboring at, I allow not; I do not acknowledge to be right, just, holy, or profitable.

"But what I hate, that do I.] I am a slave, and under the absolute control of my tyrannical master. I hate his service, but am obliged to work his will. Who, without blasphemy, can assert that the apostle is speaking this of a man in whom the Spirit of the Lord dwells? * * It is evident that those two principles, residing and counteracting each other in the same person, are *reason* and *lust*. * * And it is very easy to distinguish these two I's, or principles, in every part of the elegant description of iniquity domineering over the light and remonstrances of reason. For instance, verse 17: 'Now, then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.' The 'I' he speaks of here is opposed to indwelling or governing sin, and therefore plainly denotes the principle of reason, the inward man, or law of the mind, in which, I add, a measure of the light of the Spirit of God shines, in order to show the sinfulness of sin. These two different principles he calls, one flesh, and the other spirit (Gal. 5 : 17);

where he speaks of their contrariety in the same manner that he does here.

"And we may give a probable reason why the apostle dwells so long upon the struggle and opposition between these two principles. It appears intended to answer a tacit but very obvious objection. The Jew might allege, 'But the law is holy and spiritual, and I assent to it as good, as a right rule of action, which ought to be observed; yea, I esteem it highly. I glory and rest in it, convinced of its truth and excellency. And is not this enough to constitute the law a sufficient principle of sanctification?' The apostle answers, 'No; wickedness is consistent with a sense of the truth. A man may assent to the best rule of action, and yet still be under the dominion of lust and sin, from which nothing can deliver him but a principle and power proceeding from the Fountain of life.'

> "My reason this, my passion that persuades;
> I see the right, and I approve it too;
> Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue.

"It is no more I.] It is not that I which constitutes reason and conscience, but sin, corrupt and sensual inclinations, that dwelleth in me; that have the entire dominion over my reasoning, darkening my understanding, and perverting my judgment, for which there is condemnation in

the law, but no cure. So we find here that there is a principle in the unregenerate man stronger than reason itself. * * This is * * the seed of the serpent, by which the whole soul is darkened, confused, perverted, and excited to rebellion against God.

"Verse 19. For the good that I would, I do not.] * * The plain state of the case is this: The soul is so completely fallen that it has no power to do good till it receive that power from on high. But it has power to see good, to distinguish between that and evil, to acknowledge the excellence of this good, and to will it from a conviction of that excellence; but further it can not go. Yet, in various cases, it solicited and consents to sin; and because it is will; that is, because it is a free principle it must necessarily possess this power; and although it can do no good unless it receive grace from God, yet it is impossible to force it to sin. Even Satan himself can not do this. Before he can get it to sin he must gain its consent. Thus God, in his endless mercy, has endued this faculty with a power in which, humanly speaking, resides the salvability of the soul; and without this the soul must have eternally continued under the power of sin, or been saved as an inert, absolutely passive machine, which supposition would go as nearly to prove that it was as incapable of vice

as it were of virtue. * * Of the person represented here by the apostle it is said, to will is present with me; * * but how to perform that which is good, I find not; that is, the man is unregenerate, and he is seeking justification and holiness from the law. The law was never designed to give these. It gives the knowledge, not the cure of sin. Therefore, though he wills evil and wills good, yet he can neither conquer the one nor perform the other till he recieves the grace of Christ; till he seeks and finds redemption in his blood. Here, then, the free agency of man is preserved, without which he could not be in a salvable state; and the honor of the grace of Christ is maintained, without which there can be no actual salvation.

* * * * * * *

"To say that the inward man means the regenerate part of the soul is supportable by no argument. * * This expression, therefore, 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man,' can mean no more than this, that there are some inward faculties [reason and conscience] in the soul, which delight in the law of God. This expression is particularly adapted to the principles of the Pharisees, of whom St. Paul was one before his conversion. They received the law as the oracles of God, and confessed that it deserved the most serious regard. Their veneration was inspired by a

sense of its original, and a full conviction that it was true. To some parts of it they paid the most superstitious regard. They had it written upon their phylacteries, which they carried about with them at all times. It was often read and expounded in their synagogues; and they took delight in studying its precepts. On that account both the prophets and our Lord agree in saying that they delighted in the law of God, though they regarded not its chief and most essential precepts. * * Verse 23. But I see another law in my members, [lust] warring against the law of my mind [reason and conscience] and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin. He does not here speak of an occassional advantage gained by sin; it was a complete and final victory gained by corruption. * * The basest slave of sin, who has any remaining checks of conscience, can not be brought into a worse state than that described here by the apostle. Sin and corruption have a final triumph; and *conscience* and *reason* are taken prisoners, laid in fetters, and *sold* for *slaves*. Can this ever be said of a man in whom the Spirit of God dwells, and whom the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made free from the law of sin and death? (See chap. 8: 2.) * * The assertion that 'every Christian, however advanced in the divine life, will and must feel all this inward conflict,' &c., is as

untrue as it is dangerous. That many called Christians, and probably sincere, do feel all this may be readily granted; and such we must consider to be in the same state with Saul of Tarsus previous to his conversion. * * We must take heed how we make our experience, which is the result of our unbelief and unfaithfulness, the standard for the people of God, and lower down Christianity to our most reprehensible and dwarfish state."

For the benefit of any reader who may imagine that the church at Rome were unsanctified and in need of the "second work," or any who may imagine that "we can never be free from sin in this life," I quote from the sixth chapter of the epistle before us. In the twenty-second verse Paul declares, "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Did the apostle mean free? He said "free." Did he mean that they were holy? He said so. "Ye have your fruit unto holiness." When a man is free from sin he is holy. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." (John 8: 36.) Dr. Barnes thinks Paul was speaking of "his own experience since he became a Christian and an apostle." (Notes on Rom. 7: 14.) Did he, in a state of slavery to sin, set himself up as a teacher of men who, he declares, were free from sin, and

holy? No ordinary, unbiased mind can believe it. That Paul was not giving his Christian experience in Rom. 7: 14–25 is made certain by his statement in Rom. 8: 2, "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Was Paul free from sin? He says so. Who dares contradict? Was he a bound, sold slave under sin, and free from sin at the same time? President Mahan and Dr. Clarke say, "No." Common sense says, "No." It is impossible.

2. Scripture.—*Heb.* 6: 1–3.

"*Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And this will we do if God permit.*"

The stress is (by the theologians) laid on the words, "Let us go on unto perfection." Probably no six words have been so often misunderstood and misapplied as these. They have been quoted hundreds of times to convey the idea that there are a lower and a higher order of Christians, an imperfect salvation and a perfect salvation, an

imperfect holiness and a perfect holiness; that the blood of Christ at its first application never cleanses from all sin, but the soul must educate for a length of time, and afterward be fully cleansed. I know not that any respectable author has, with his pen, definitely committed himself to the position that the apostle meant by these words positively to teach that there are grades in the moral character of Christians. Yet it has been continually used as a ready bomb to be thrown on all occasions for the purpose of alarming an approaching force, or, like a scuttle-fish, to muddy the waters and escape in the mud.

Let us prayerfully and honestly search to know what Paul meant when he used the words.

1. Did he mean moral progress or intellectual progress? Did he mean heart-progress or head progress? Did he mean progress in moral purity or in theological knowledge? He doubtless meant the latter. That he did not refer to the moral state of his Hebrew brethren is quite obvious from the following considerations:

1. He believed they were holy. In the first verse of the third chapter he so declares—"Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling."

(1) They were called to be holy.

(2) They were "partakers of this heavenly calling."

(3) They *were* holy; he declares it.

(4) Dr. Barnes says on the place, "The word holy is applied to them to denote that they were set apart to God, or that they were sanctified. The Jews were often called a 'holy people,' as being consecrated to God; and Christians are holy not only as consecrated to God, but as sanctified."

It is well known that neither Dr. Barnes nor any other Calvinist is an enthusiast for sanctification. Yet the doctrine is constrained by the force of Paul's declaration to say they were "sanctified."

(5) Dr. Clark says, "Holy brethren.] Persons consecrated to God, as the word literally implies, and called, in consequence, to the holy in heart, holy in life, and useful in the world. * * The Holy God will not receive unholy persons. This living Head will not admit of dead members."

2. The apostle proposes to leave first principles,—to depart in their onward march of investigation from the rudiments of the system or thing in which he proposed to find perfection,—the system of revealed truth.

(1) In heart-work the first steps are faith, rejection of sin, and consecration to God.

(2) There can be no heart-progress, no ad-

vance in heart-purity, where these are discontinued. The soul that "leaves these principles, that ceases trusting in God, submitting to God, and rejecting sin, will not, *can* not go forward, but will suddenly and surely go backward and downward.

To leave faith behind in any supposed "going on" would be to "go on" not *to* perfection, nor *in* perfection, but to ruin, in unbelief, away from perfection. To leave the soul-principle of rejecting sin would be to embrace sin. This would not be going unto perfection, but plunging into ruin. To leave the soul-state of consecration to God in an imaginary "going on unto perfection" would be one of the most complete and decided cases of self-deception and self-ruin that ever occurred in the history of the universe.

3. The apostle's very words plainly indicate to any one who has not a pet theory to defend that his mind is fixed on doctrine, and that it is the climactory point of theological truth to which he is endeavoring to lead the minds of his Hebrew brethren. Doctrine is his theme. "Leaving first or rudimental doctrinal principles, let us go on in our investigation of doctrines till we can stand and gaze with unclouded vision on the highest peak, the loftiest fact, the sublimest truth in the whole system of revealed religion. There is

perfection somewhere. Your souls have been looking into the historic wonders of the past, and anxiously peering into the infinite depths of the future to rest your eye on the central point of all good. Your Jewish brethren, loath to lose you from their ceremonial worship,—their mechanical religion,—are harrassing your minds with their scoffs at your poor Nazarene carpenter, with not a meeting-house to worship in, and not a priest to officiate. They have almost bewildered you with boasts about their father Abraham, who walked and talked with God; their Moses and the law which God wrote for him with his own finger on tables of stone; their hierarchy established by High Heaven; their prophets, through whom God spoke to the unborn millions in the ages to come of events which should occur in their midst; the wonders, signs, and miracles which the God of Israel wrought for his people through the ages past. All these things you have to admit. Taking advantage of this, they have reasoned you almost blind. You have listened to them too long. You ought to be well posted by this time, and able to teach others; but ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles (revealed truths or doctrines) of God. I see that you are so far confused with their sophistry—their false reasoning based on well-known truths—that

ye are in great danger of backsliding and apostatizing. Well, I have (in the five preceding chapters) refreshed your memories on rudimental principles and several points in the character and office of your chosen Christ, who is so much ridiculed by our Jewish kinsmen, wrapped in the blindness of their carnality. And now if you will, with me, just pass on from these first principles of doctrine, such as the doctrine of baptisms, —baptism by the Holy Ghost, by which your hearts were washed, and baptism with water, in which you made a public profession of faith in the triune God, and of the inward baptism he had performed,—and of laying on of hands, of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment, I will show you that the Nazarene whom you have chosen as your religious leader possesses in himself the embodiment of all the good you seek, or can seek, or will ever be able to know. He is the embodiment of perfection. Follow me, and I will show you this grandest of all facts. You had the true, saving light when you embraced him and obtained the heavenly gift of salvation by the power of the Holy Ghost. This heavenly power and truth which redeemed you came only through the blood of Jesus of Nazareth. It can never reach a soul of our race through any other medium. Therefore, if you fall away, if you forsake

Christ and go back to Judaism, or to any other religious system, you are forever lost. Come on, and I will show you that moral purity can be found nowhere else in the wide universe of God, save only in the teachings, sufferings, atoning blood, and personal, quickening, purifying, spiritual power of Jesus the Christ, your chosen Lord. He is God manifested in the flesh. God alone can save. All the law and the prophets pointed at him. They had no more power to save than a guide-board has to take a man to a city. They could never make the corners thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience. The law made nothing perfect. Christ does. In embracing him, you have embraced the sum of all excellency. You have embraced perfection. You are far above the terrors of Sinai, which made even Moses to exclaim, "I exceedingly fear and quake." Our kinsmen cling to the old guide-boards which pointed at our Christ. But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than

Abel. See, then, that ye refuse not nor turn away from him who has spoken to you by all the history of the past, by his Son, and by his Holy Spirit, shedding abroad his love, joy, and peace in your hearts; for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, surely we shall not escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven."

No scriptural truth is more obvious than that Paul's central object was the establishment of the faith of his Hebrew brethren in their chosen Christ, from whom others were endeavoring to turn them away. No other means would be so likely to accomplish his object as a presentation of the perfection of Christ and his great salvation in contrast with Judaism and its utter inefficiency and insignificancy as a means of salvation apart from the perfect Christ, at whom all the law and prophets pointed as their soul and center. Even Dr. Albert Barnes, who believed that "men do not fall from grace," acknowledges the position here taken. He says, "The general purpose of this epistle is to preserve those to whom it was sent from the danger of apostasy. Their danger on this subject did not arise so much from persecution as from the circumstances that were fitted to attract them again to the Jewish religion." (Intro.) "The apostle was addressing Christians. He was en-

deavoring to keep them from apostasy." (Notes on 6 : 4.)

Thus it appears that it is a very great perversion of Paul's intention to say that he referred to progress in moral purity when he uttered the words, "Let us go on unto perfection." He was addressing "holy brethren, partakers of the heavcalling" (3 : 1), who had "tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and had tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come." (6 : 4, 5.) They were perfect Christians.

3. SCRIPTURE.—*Eph.* 5 : 25, 27.

"Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it," etc.

The stress is laid on the words, "SANCTIFY AND CLEANSE IT."

The assumption is—with little or no argument—that Christ's church needs cleansing; and this cleansing the church would be a "second work" in the hearts of Christians. We may remark,

1. The apostle did not contemplate the Ephesian brethren as in need of the second cleansing; for if we turn to the third and fourth verses of the first chapter of this same letter we shall find that he regarded them as *holy*. He says, "Blessed be the

God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love."

(1) They were "blessed with *all* spiritual bless ings." Would not this include sanctification?

(2) These "*all* spiritual blessings" were bestowed in accordance with a fixed invariable arrangement that his children "should be *holy* and without blame before him in love."

(3) Then surely they were blessed with "holiness, according as he hath chosen."

2. If the text affords any argument for the second-word doctrine, it must teach that the church of Christ is, or has been, first, unholy, and secondly, that it has become, or will yet become holy.

(1) Does it teach that the church ever was unholy? It clearly implies that the persons who now compose the church once needed a moral cleansing. But were they his church when they were in a state of moral pollution? No; for we have just seen (chapter 1, verses 3, 4) that his eternal arrangement is that his church "should be holy." Moreover, if they were his church when unholy, then what is the difference between the church and the world? They were not, of course.

But we must remember that the text teaches nothing as to a time when the church was unholy. Nor is there a syllable in the sacred Scriptures affirming anything of the sort. Paul abundantly affirms the contrary in his letters to the Romans and Corinthians. "The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." The Hebrews he calls "holy brethren." He charges the Thessalonians to read his letter "to all the holy brethren," plainly intimating that he regarded them as such.

Thus it becomes obvious that at least a large portion of the church was holy in the days of Paul. When, then, was the church of Christ unholy? There is not a scrap of evidence that the real, spiritual church, the mystic body of Christ, ever was unholy.

(2) Is the church now unholy? Many would have us believe that there are thousands of unholy persons in the church of Christ. This is the opinion of all double-birth theologians, and all Calvinists. And while it is undeniably and lamentably true that there are many unholy persons who claim to be of the church of Christ, and probably many sincerely, yet it is utterly against Paul's definition of "the kingdom of God" to suppose that their claim is just. The kingdom is "right-

eousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Therefore, all who are in this kingdom are in a state of righteousness—holiness.

3. Now let us ask whether we can believe that Paul was really trying to inculcate the doctrine of the second work by means of the language of our text.

Supposing he believed it, would he have undertaken to teach it with such meager, distant, indirect hints? Would he have treated a doctrine of such vast importance, as it would be if true, so lightly? No man can justly accuse the energetic Paul of such trifling recreancy in dealing with eternal interests, as this would be.

Mark, he says nothing about a second work, nor a first work. He says nothing about sin in believers, nor removing inbred corruption from the justified. He says nothing about "the depths of pride, self-will, and hell," in regenerate hearts. He says nothing about removing these from the hearts of his children. He clearly shows that "Christ died for the ungodly." He shows that he gave his life as a ransom for the rebellious captive. He tells us that "he tasted death for every man." He teaches in our text that immaculate holiness is what Christ has purchased for those who will embrace him, and that holiness is the moral character of his church. He clearly teaches

that the Lamb will not accept a polluted bride; that the bride must be perfectly pure; that none but the perfectly pure will be accepted in the great day. But he says not a word about "justifying the impure," the "carnal," the "unholy," the "sold under sin," the "enslaved," and then afterward sanctifying them

Our text says Christ gave himself for the church; that is, the persons composing the church. But we know they were rough sinners before they were in his church. Then he gave himself for rough sinners that he might sanctify them, and so make a church of them. Such is Paul's teaching in our text. In another place he quotes it thus: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor efieminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such *were some* of *you:* but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (I. Cor. 6: 9–11.)

"Here are ten classes of transgressors which the apostle excludes from the kingdom of God; and any man who is guilty of any one of the evils

mentioned above, is thereby excluded from this kingdom, whether it simply be the church of Christ here below, or the state of glory hereafter." (Clarke.)

And it is certain, according to the Savior's words (Matt. 5: 28), that the inward action—the heart-action—is all the same before God as the outward action. If then the heart be in favor of any of these things—these ten items—mentioned by Paul, such a heart is unrighteous, and consequently excluded from the spiritual church, the righteous kingdom of Christ; for "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." According to Dr. Clarke, who is claimed as a second-work theologian, whatever moral state excludes the soul from the "state of glory hereafter," also "excludes it from the church of Christ here."

The church of Jesus Christ consists wholly and exclusively of persons who were once sinners, but are now "washed, sanctified, justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." "The bride, the Lamb's wife" is not filled with "the depths of pride, self-will, the work of the devil, and hell," as Mr. Wesley has it in his "Plain Account of Christian Perfection," page 10. The bride is a finer lady than all that would indicate. Probably many who fancy they are of the bride, are sadly and ruinously mistaken. They

"have a name to live and are dead." "Having a form of godliness, they deny [or at least are destitute of] the power thereof; from such turn away." (II. Tim. 3: 5.)

4. Scripture.—*Gal.* 5: 17.

"*For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye can not do the things that ye would.*"

Bishop Castle omitted the last clause when he quoted from this text in discussion on this subject. Just why he did this I do not pretend to say. It certainly adds emphasis to the passage. Possibly the bishop thought it added too much emphasis. It certainly makes the case too strong for his purpose. It makes just such a case of spiritual bondage as the one presented by this learned apostle in his letter to the church at Rome. (7: 14–25.) It is too clearly a case of slavery to carnality to pass for a representation of the Christian character. It was addressed to backsliders. Let us go back to the first chapter and pick up a few of the evidences of this fact, which are strewed through the epistle.

"I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel." (Gal. 1: 6.) "O foolish Galatians,

who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth?" (Gal. 3: 1.) "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" Gal. 4: 9.) * * (11.) "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." * * (19, 20.) "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you."

"YE ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE." (Gal. 5: 4.) This settles the point. Some of them, at last, had "fallen from grace." So much is absolutely certain. Dr. Clarke tersely remarks on this place, "They had been brought into the grace of the gospel; and now, by re-adopting the Mosaic ordinances, they had apostatized from the gospel as a system of religion, and had lost the grace communicated to their souls, by which they were preserved in a state of salvation. The peace and love of God, received by Jesus Christ, could not remain in the hearts of those who had rejected Christ. They had, therefore, in every sense of the word, fallen from grace; and whether some of them ever rose again is more than we can tell."

Such were the persons to whom the apostle says "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and

the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye can not do the things that ye would." Slaves were they; "carnal, sold under sin." They were greatly in need of the advice he had just penned (verse 16), "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh." On this Dr. Clarke most appropriately remarks, "Get back that Spirit of God which you have grieved and lost; take up that spiritual religion which you have abandoned. If the Spirit of God dwell in and rule your heart, the whole carnal mind will be destroyed; and then, not only carnal ordinances will be abandoned, but also the works and propensities of the flesh."

(1.) Either the doctor is wrong, or the second-work theologians are wrong. He says, "If the Spirit of God dwell and rule in the heart, the whole carnal mind will be destroyed, together with the works and propensities of the flesh."

(2. It is well known and admitted on all hands that the Spirit of God dwells and rules in the heart of every regenerate soul.

(3.) It follows, then, that every regenerate soul is free from the carnal mind.

Let us now honestly ask ourselves the question, Did Paul intend to inculcate the second-work doctrine by means of our present text? And if so, in what manner did he expect to accomplish his ob-

ject? (1.) The general proposition of the text would not inculcate it any more than the proposition which he announced in his letter to the Romans, "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8: 7.) The two propositions express precisely the same doctrine. Yet no one ever quotes the latter to prove the second-word doctrine.

(2. He could not have intended to direct attention to a specific case or class of cases, for the purpose of accomplishing the supposed object; for he was surely not directing attention to any other specific case but that of the Galatians; and their case could not possibly answer the supposed purpose, seeing they were backsliders; and backsliders are not in the enjoyment of the first work, saying nothing about the second. They, like the church at Ephesus, had "left their first love," and "fallen from grace."

Thus we see that there is no evidence of any kind in support of the idea that our text was ever intended to teach the doctrine that a regenerate soul is full of sin. If that had been his intention he could very easily have said it plainly; but he never said it. Hence we have a right to infer that he never believed it. He surely would have

taught it if he had believed it; for, if true, it would be exceedingly important.

5. SCRIPTURE.—*James* 4: 5, 6.

"*Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy? But he giveth more grace.*"

This text has been very little used by the second-work theologians. They are almost universally unable to see in it any evidence in support of their doctrine. Bishop Castle, however, used it in his answer to the question, "Can a man be born of God without being sanctified?" His only comment on it is this, "Here grace is multiplied in order to meet this inward antagonism."

As Dr. Clarke has been quoted by Bishop Castle, and Dr. Wood as a good witness in their case, his testimony on this case will, of course, be highly acceptable with them and others of the same school. I will therefore give it in full. He says:

"This verse is exceedingly obscure. We can not tell what scripture St. James refers to. Many have been produced by learned men, as that which he had particularly in view. Some think Genesis 6: 5, 'Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.' 'The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.' (Gen.

8: 21.) Moses said unto him, 'Enviest thou for my sake?' (Numbers 9: 29.) 'The soul of the wicked desireth evil.' (Prov. 21: 10.) None of these scriptures, nor any others, contain the precise words of this verse; and therefore St. James may probably refer not to any particular portion, but to the Spirit and design of the scripture in those various places where it speaks against envy, covetousness, worldly associations, &c., &c.

"Perhaps the words in this and the two succeeding verses may be well paraphrased thus, 'Do ye think that concerning these things the scripture speaketh falsely, or that the Holy Spirit which dwells in us can excite us to envy others, instead of being contented with the state in which the providence of God has placed us? Nay, far otherwise; for he giveth us more grace to enable us to bear the ills of life, and to lie in deep humility at his feet, knowing that his Holy Spirit has said (Prov. 3: 34), God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble. Seeing these things are so, submit yourselves to God, resist the devil, who would tempt you to envy, and he will flee from you; draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you.'

"I must leave this sense as the best I can give. There is not a critic in Europe that has considered the passage who has not been puzzled with it. I

think the fifth verse should be understood as giving a contrary sense to that in our translation. Every genuine Christian is a habitation of the Holy Ghost, and that Spirit excites strong desires against envy; therefore a man must not suppose that he is a Christian if he have an envious or covetous heart."

1. All will agree that the Holy Spirit never "lusteth to envy," but incites the precise contrary feeling in the heart where it abides.

2. All agree that it abides, as the doctor says, in every Christian's heart.

3. Therefore there is at least one almighty opposer of envy in every Christian's heart.

4. The heart of the regenerate soul can not "lust to envy;" for this would be a direct and positive violation of that great law which says, "Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbor's." Envy is the desire for the good which belongs to our neighbor, mingled with a feeling of malevolence toward that neighbor. It is, therefore, a violation of the first commandment in the Decalogue, which forbids idolatry; for Paul declares that "covetousness is idolatry" (Col. 3: 5); and also of that "golden rule," which says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is impossible to obey this with envy in the heart. Moreover it involves a violation of that other sacred

command, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world." (I. John 2: 15.) For envy is an impossibility in the heart where there is no love of the world, nor of things that are in the world. In a word, envy involves a violation of the "first and great commandment," the great fundamental rule underlying the whole system of God's moral government; namely, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." (Matt. 22: 37.) For we have seen that envy is impossible in the heart where the love of the world is absent; and John declares that "if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." (I. John 2: 15.) If the love of the Father is not in him, he is unable, of course, to obey the command which requires all men to love him with all their powers. And, further, if he have not that love it is certain that he is destitute of the Holy Ghost which always sheds abroad that love in every heart where he abides. This makes him a violator of that other command which says, "Be filled with the Spirit."

Thus then we see that the envious spirit is a violator of at least six commands, namely:

1. "Thou shalt not covet."
2. "Love not the world."
3. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

This is against every form of idolatry; and we have seen that covetousness is idolatry."

4. "Be filled with the Spirit."

5. "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

6. "Love God with all thy heart, soul, and mind."

It would be very easy to show that a spirit which is in a state of opposition to all these commands is also in opposition to all the others. And when we consider that "whosoever is born of God doth not [and in this state can not] commit sin," (I. John 3: 9) we must stand amazed in view of the gross misrepresentation of the Christian character and of God's word in relation to that character, which has proceeded from the tongues and pens of learned bishops and doctors who hold that "the Spirit which dwells within the regenerate soul lusteth to envy;" that a Christian spirit may be an envious spirit. At one time they tell us that "even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin." At another time they tell us that even the dark, ugly crime of envy, involving at least six other gross crimes, is quite consistent with the regenerate state. Surely, they hold a mixed and a changeable theology.

Well, we see clearly that envy is not compatible with the regenerate spirit; and we know assuredly that the Holy Spirit, which dwells in the re-

generate spirit, never lusteth to envy. It is certain, then, that two spirits dwelling in the Christian body—"the temple of God"—(I. Cor. 3: 16) are perfectly clear of envy. If then there be a spirit in such a temple, that "lusteth to envy," it must certainly be a third spirit,—the spirit of darkness,—the old Diabolus of hell. This brings us back to John Wesley's "depth of pride, self-will, and hell, in the child of God." (C. P., page 10.) This idea has been met under "*Objections*" 13 and 21.) "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" These never dwell harmoniously and peacefully in the same heart. But the justified soul is the abode of perfect peace, as all Christians do certainly know. (See Rom. 5: 1–5; and Isa. 26: 3.)

If, then, the ugly sin of envy is not harmonious with the Holy Spirit, nor the Christian spirit; and if Satan can not dwell in the Christian's heart, then it follows that there can be no spirit in the Christian which "lusteth to envy." Whoever, therefore, holds that James wished, by our text, to designate a certain class of persons in whom there dwells a spirit which "lusteth to envy," he must, to be consistent, hold that he pointed at the persons he addressed in the four verses next preceding our text. Let us read them.

"From whence come wars and fightings among

you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and can not obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God. Do ye think," &c.

They were 1. Prayerless—at heart. 2. Contentious. 3. Criminally lascivious. 4. Covetous. 5. Lovers of the world. 6. Murderers.

No one will deny that they needed a second work, if they ever had the first. No one doubts that an envious, hideous, devilish spirit raged and ruled within them. We must dismiss them as incompetent witnesses in the case. They are spurious specimens. They can not be accepted as samples. But they are the persons James was directly addressing when he penned our text. A doctrine that needs such testimony as comes from such characters is in a beggarly condition surely.

6. SCRIPTURE.—*Luke* 8: 14.

"*And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection.*"

"Here," says Bishop Castle, "the wheat and the tares grew together. They did not amalgamate; but they grew together in the same soil. So good and evil may be resident in the same moral nature, and may war with each other for the ascendancy." (*Tel.*, June 19, 1878.)

1. Remember, it is not stated that the word produced any effect on their hearts; only "they heard" it.

2. It is not said that they brought forth any fruit at all.

3. Let us go back and read the three verses next preceding the text. "*Now the parable is this. The seed is the word of God.* [Not men, nor moral principles or qualities, but simply truth.] *Those* [persons who are represented by the seed falling] *by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.* [Diabolus wants no one to be saved.] *They* [who are represented by the seed falling] *on the rock are they, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root,* [no depth of earth, or understanding] *which for awhile believe, and in time of temptation fall away. And that* [seed] *which fell among thorns are they,* [represents those] *which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked* [suffer the truth to be choked or crowded out] *with cares and riches and*

pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection." The word produces no effect in this case. No fruit; no action in harmony with the truth. The bishop goes a little in advance of the Savior when he says, "Here the wheat and the thorns grew together." The Savior does not even say that the seed did so much as to sprout, or germinate among the thorny cares, lusts, and anxieties of the hearts ingrossed with riches. The seed or truth did not grow at all. It produced neither fruit nor blade. It was choked out. And is not this generally the case with rich people, and even those who are not rich, but wishing and struggling to be. They seldom actually hear or read the word. When they do hear, that is the end of it. When they hear Gabriel's trumpet, hearing will not be the end of it.

We can not take this as a case; for the seed or truth never led them to seek even a first work, let alone the second. We may imagine wheat and thorns growing together, yet we have no right to represent Jesus as giving such a case to illustrate the corruption of the Christian heart, for he never did it for any purpose. He only—in this case—illustrated the danger of riches, and the comparative uselessness of preaching to the rich.

7. SCRIPTURE.—*I. John* 2: 16.

"*The lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.*"

On this text Bishop Castle remarks, "Is there no seeking of fleshly gratification, no sensual and impure desires, no love of parade, gaudy dress, and costly decoration among Christian people; no seeking of honorable distinctions, and loud boastings of office and position among Christian men, and even ministers of the word? Whence do these come but from the impurity that yet reigns within? Indeed, this is so apparent that to pause for reasoning upon it is but to contradict a judgment that has ripened into unquestioned certainty. That there is a measure of holiness in every regenerate heart is evident from the following:" (Here he quoted II. Cor. 7: 1.)

1. Here the bishop uses the words of the pure and lovely Apostle John, as evidence in support of the doctrine that a man can be a Christian, on his way to heaven, with a heart full of lasciviousness, "eyes full of adultery, and that can not cease from sin," (see II. Pet. 2: 14) lips laden with "loud boastings," and a life and appearance which evince a soul full of pride and worldly ambition.

2. The bishop wants us to understand that

God justifies all these things, pride, ambition, bombast, lasciviousness, and general impurity reigning within. And with all this devilishness (Wesley says, "All sin is the work of the devil") "there is a measure of holiness." (Have I not justly called it mixed theology?)

3. I read in God's holy word that God resisteth the proud."

4. I read from the lips of Jesus (Matt. 5: 28) that a lustful look is a crime. All sin begins in the heart, in the thoughts. A murderous intention is as really murder in the sight of God as cutting a man's throat. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." (I. John 3: 15.)

5. No man can do the things which the bishop here attributes to Christians, basing his description on our text from John, without a very strong love for the world. But John says, in the very first verse preceding our text, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."

6. Thus it appears most explicitly that the bishop has greatly misapplied the text.

7. So long as both wings of the Protestant church—both Calvinists and Armenians—persist in teaching that a man can be a Christian on his way to heaven, and at the same time "FULL OF SIN TILL DEATH;" full of "all the hidden abominations there, the depth of pride, self-will, and hell, yet

having the witness in themselves, 'Thou art an heir of God, a joint-heir with Christ,'" just so long will the real, mystic body of Christ, the real spiritual church, the lovely "bride, the Lamb's wife," be hampered, incumbered, weighed down, and hindered in the glorious work assigned her, and in which she loves to engage, by a circumjacent and superincumbent mass of corruption, in the hearts of pretended friends.

Let us look again at our text, and see if we can make it fit the Christian character. "The lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world."

These sins are of the sinful world—characteristics of the wicked; yet we are to believe that they descended from God in the heart of his regenerate child, and that the apostle has presented them to our view as a picture of God's dear children, possessing, as Bishop Castle tells us, "every feature of the divine nature or image." From such a picture of the divine image we can well afford to turn away.

8. SCRIPTURE.—*John* 15: 2, 3.

"*Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.*"

Bishop Castle says, "This branch was fruit-

bearing, and yet needed cleansing in order to greater fruitfulness." (*Tel.*, *June* 26, 1878.)

"This branch." I should like to know which one. He was not designating one branch, but a class, even all fruitful branches. No others will continue to be branches. The unfruitful branches will quickly fall away. But "every fruitful branch he purgeth, that it may bring forth more fruit."

1. This "every branch that bringeth fruit" certainly includes the sanctified ones, no matter when they became sanctified; for no others are so well prepared to bring fruit, even if it were conceded that the unsanctified can bear the fruit referred to.

2. Well, according to the bishop's view of the text, all these fuitful, sanctified persons will still need to be "cleansed in order to greater fruitfulness."

3. The Savior said to his eleven apostles, "Now ye are clean." Then they were in the proper moral condition to bring fruit. Yet, notwithstanding this, they still needed a moral cleansing to make them more fruitful, according to the bishop's view of the text.

4. According to the bishop's idea the Savior's arrangement would stand about this way:

(1) The pure in heart bring fruit.

(2) Then they are cleansed.

(3) Then they bring more fruit.

(4) Then they obtain another moral cleansing, and so on.

(5) Who can understand this? It is like Dr. Watson's perpetual cleansing a soul that was suddenly made clean in the start.

Dr. Clarke, whom these authors love to quote, says on the place, "The branch which bears not fruit, the husbandman taketh it away; but the branch that beareth fruit, he taketh away from it; that is, he prunes away excrescences, and removes everything that might hinder its increasing fruitfulness. The verb * * signifies ordinarily to cleanse, purge, purify, but is certainly to be taken in the sense of pruning, or cutting off, in this text," as the verb *purgare* is used by Horace Cuttello *proprios purgantem leniter ungues*, "Composedly paring his own nails with a pen-knife."

Note a few facts.

1. No grape-vine naturally needs cleansing from pollution, and therefore could not properly be used as and illustration of moral cleansing.

2. It is one of the most tractable of plants.

3. The intelligent dresser clips it back for several purposes: (1) To control its form and strength and the number of its coming clusters. (2) After the young clusters are formed on the new branches he often clips these branches just beyond the

farthest clusters to prevent a waste of sap in unnecessary timber and foliage, saving it for the clusters.

So our blessed Father in heaven often clips back the arrangements, projects, and expectations of his children, to prevent a waste of time, talent, means, strength, and influence on useless things, and utilize them in the advancement of his kingdom, the salvation of souls, and the glory of his name. Blessed and useful is the man who takes it cheerfully and lovingly when his God, by afflictions, disappointments, or disconcertions, clips him back, and so keeps his powers properly harnessed, directed, and employed, giving beauty to his record, sheaves for his harvest, and stars for his crown. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth." (Paul.) "He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." (David.) "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." (Daniel.)

9. SCRIPTURE.—*Matt.* 19: 14.

"*Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven.*"

Luke says, "*For of such is the kingdom of God.*" (Luke 18: 16.)

This is one of the texts employed by Bishop Castle for the purpose of establishing the idea or doctrine that moral pollution may and actually does hold a justified and approved relation and place in God's moral government and spiritual kingdom. He starts out by saying:

"Our Savior clearly asserts that little children belong to his kingdom." He then quotes our text and its parallel in Luke.

He then proceeds to prove—what no one denies—that Jesus referred, in the text, to his spiritual kingdom.

Next he affirms—and justly—the identity of the Lord's spiritual kingdom on earth with his glorified kingdom in heaven. He says:

"Whatever else may be meant, we are most certainly safe in affirming that God's spiritual kingdom—his invisible church, this mystic body of Christ,—is included in this phrase, 'The kingdom of heaven.' * * In Ephesians 3: 15 it is called a family, and embraces the redeemed of every age and clime, and also those already in heaven. In Hebrews 12: 23 it is called the 'general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.'"

He then proceeds to affirm their membership in

this spiritual kingdom—this heavenly family. He says:

"Perhaps one of the most conclusive proofs of the relationship of infants to the mystic body of Christ, and their consequent security in him, is to be found in the words of Jesus, 'Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth him that sent me.'" (Luke 9: 47, 48.)

Next he proceeds to affirm the moral pollution of infants. He says:

"1. They derive their nature from a fallen parentage. 'Adam begat a son in his own likeness and after his own image.' Paul says, 'By one man's disobedience many were made sinners.' A corrupt state of human nature obtained through the fall, and is the common inheritance of all that have that nature. All are regarded sinful because this corrupt nature is out of harmony with the perfect law of God, and never can be conformed to it. This want of conformity is unrighteousness, and 'all unrighteousness is sin.'"

"2. The necessity for the new birth teaches this want of holiness. The necessity for this rebirth is founded on the nature of our first birth, which is affirmed to be a birth of the flesh, and consequently is flesh. Paul says, 'They that are in the flesh can not please God.' This unfitness

for the kingdom of God, it will be observed, 'is by birth,' and not the result of what is done. It is an inheritance. * * As a principle, God dwells with and in a temple that is holy; but as a fact, he dwells in spiritual relations where impurity is affirmed." (Moral Status of Infants, Sanctification, Tel., Oct. 22, 1879.)

I have given this excellent Christian gentleman so much space that his position and argument may be fairly understood. Let us prayerfully look at it in the light of God's holy word.

1. The bishop made a grave oversight when he said, "Our Savior clearly asserts that little children belong to his kingdom." The Scriptures give us no such assertion. Jesus said, "Of such is." Not that they "belong to," or are in it, or a part of it.

2. When "Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18: 2, 3), it was not for the purpose of illustrating and teaching that his kingdom was full of innate corruption and sin, but for the exact contrary. They had come to him, with hearts full of worldly ambition, inquiring who would be his chief officers in the kingdom which they were expecting him

to set up in visible, worldly form. He took the child, and rebuked their ambition. He always used the obvious to illustrate the abstruse, and never the reverse. The obvious—the visible—character of the child is the farthest removed from worldly ambition. He told them they must be converted and possess the humble, gentle, quiet spirit which is an obvious characteristic of the child; that there was no eminence to be achieved in his kingdom by means of worldly ambition. His kingdom is not of this world, and the means and methods of achieving worldly glory are the very means and methods to lose all in his kingdom. Humility marks the road to true greatness. Look at the unassuming child, and see what you must be if you would be truly great and highly appreciated by your Lord.

3. "This unfitness for the kingdom of God," says the bishop, "is by birth, and not the result of what is done. It is an inheritance."

And yet, notwithstanding their unfitness, he would have us believe that they are actually in the kingdom. This is rather startling. The kingdom of God is represented to us in the sacred word as one of fitness, order, precision. But the bishop would have us believe that it is largely composed of material which is wholly unfit. "The holy kingdom in heaven and the spiritual king-

dom on earth are all one," he says, truly. And the word says, "Unto the Son he saith, A scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom." (Heb. 1: 8.) And Paul declares "the kingdom of God is righteousness." (Rom. 14: 17.) Yet the bishop says there is a large infantile element in this kingdom, which is perfectly incompatible with righteousness. And his object in affirming this is to establish a principle or rule for the permission of moral pollution in this heavenly kingdom by which he may be able to show that there is also a large adult element of corruption in this righteous, holy kingdom. If this be granted, then, he thinks, the "second-work" sanctification is established, as a matter of course. And this is the main point.

4. The bishop tells us, "As a principle, [that is, as a rule,] God dwells with and in a temple that is holy; but as a fact, he dwells in spiritual relations where impurity is affirmed." He speaks with obvious timidity. But he plainly teaches that God's rule is to dwell in none but holy souls; and yet, as a matter of fact, he acts like a vascillating man, sets aside the rule, and admits elements into his kingdom which are "unfit for the kingdom of God." This is shocking theology. We have been taught "there is no variableness nor shadow of turning" in God. But this awful

theology makes the character of Deity changeable to meet its exigencies. How shall we be assured that heaven is a place of changeless order if God varies from his own rules to let disorderly elements into his kingdom? How can we know that he will not finally allow confusion to predominate and bring utter ruin? We know he will not do this. Hence we know also that he does not now permit disorderly elements into his spiritual kingdom. He deals patiently and mercifully with sinners; but that is not recognizing them as saints. He will unconditionally save all who die in infancy; for they are not capable of compliance with conditions. But this rule of his merciful conduct, based on the atonement, does not now make them holy, nor constitute them members of his mystic body.

5. The bishop says, "The necessity for this rebirth is founded on the nature of our first birth." Very well; so it is. And Jesus tells us, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Regeneration, then, is the way into the kingdom of God. Have infants been regenerated? If not, how are they in the family of God? In them resides the necessity for the rebirth. Has that necessity been removed? REGENERATION ALONE CAN REMOVE THE NECESSITY FOR REGENERATION. And regeneration is the only way

for fallen man to enter the kingdom of God. All unregenerate persons, therefore, are outside of that holy kingdom.

Moreover, if the necessity for the re-birth resides in inherited moral impurity, and if the necessity for regeneration is removed by regeneration, are we not forced to the conclusion that regeneration removes this moral impurity? Most certainly; for no necessity can be removed without the removal of its cause. The cause of the necessity of regeneration is moral impurity. Regeneration removes the necessity, but not without removing the cause, which is impurity. THEREFORE REGENERATION REMOVED ALL MORAL IMPURITY.

This is the clear and inevitable conclusion from the two propositions given us by Bishop Castle and the Savior of mankind. They also lead us to the conclusion that infants are not members of Christ's kingdom. And if they were, it would prove nothing concerning the moral condition of adult Christians; for while it is true that there are many points of coincidence in the infant with the character of the heavenly family, there are also many points of contrast.

1. The infant is in a state of blank ignorance. Who can imagine this to be an element in God's spiritual kingdom?

2. There are many things affirmed in God's

word concerning all justified persons which are not affirmed of infants. Among these are the following: "Ye are washed." "Ye are sanctified." "Ye are justified." "By one Spirit are we baptized into onebody." "Transformed by the renewing of your minds." "Ye are the temple of God." "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." "The Spirit of God dwelleth in you." "Blessed with all spiritual blessing." "Christ in you. "In Christ." "I in you, and you in me." "New creature." "Holy brethren." "Ye are clean." "Purified by faith."

All these items, and more, are affirmed of persons who, according to the highest second-work theologians, were "merely justified," and still in need of the "second work." And not one of them is affirmed of little children. Hence there is a yawning chasm of disparity between these two classes, of such fearful depth and width that the moral status of one proves nothing concerning the other. They are not in the same category. No spiritual kingdom can be in moral unity with them both in it. God dwells in every member of his spiritual family. Does he dwell in the child? Whatever argument proves that he does will prove that it is holy, "The temple of God is holy." He dwells not in an unholy temple. Whenever the temple is defiled, moral ruin

is the consequence. "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy."

If infants are in a state of moral pollution,—which has been proved by the bishop,—God dwells not in them. How, then, are they a part of his temple? How are they in his spiritual kingdom? Their case differs entirely from that of accountable persons; and the great, good-hearted Redeemer, who gave himself a ransom for all, will take care of those who leave the world in infancy.

10 SCRIPTURE.—*I. Thess.* 5 : 23.

"*And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

This is one of the standard texts with all the second-work theologians. They use it to prove that the Thessalonian brethren had never been sanctified, but only regenerated, or "justified"—"merely justified," as they are wont to express it. They say there could have been no propriety in Paul's praying God to sanctify them if they had already enjoyed that blessing. They also use it to show that the body may be sanctified as well as the soul, and that the Thessalonians lacked this item also.

1. The careful reader will readily notice that the apostle said nothing in this text about the sanctification of their bodies. Whatever may be true or false about this point, he said nothing about the sanctification of their bodies in this text. He prayed that they might be preserved blameless, soul, body, and spirit. They could not be preserved blameless before they were blameless. The prayer, therefore, favors the idea that at least some of these brethren were already blameless in spirit, soul, and body.

2. It is certain that Paul believed some of them were holy. He says, "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." (verse 27.)

3. It is also certain that there were some backsliders among them. He says, "Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly." (Verse 14.) Regenerate persons are not unruly. Some must have backslidden, and thus become unruly.

4. Thus we see clearly that Paul was consciously writing to two classes of persons—the "holy" and the "unruly."

5. But he writes to them as a whole, a body of believers, generally holy, but with exceptional cases, as there are in nearly all churches.

6. If Paul believed the second-work doctrine,

nothing can be more certain than that he preached it at Thessalonica when he labored personally among them; for his affection for them was too great to neglect anything that would add to their good, as this doctrine certainly would if true. If the soul be not made pure in regeneration, nothing can be more important to know. Paul would appreciate this, and attend to it faithfully among those Christians whom he loved so much, at the very first opportunity.

7. If he preached it to them they certainly embraced it forthwith; for we find that the doctrines which he did preach to them were speedily effectual, so that he says, "Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." (I. Thess. 1: 5.)

8. Paul was greatly pleased and delighted with the effect which his doctrines had upon them, and the exemplary lives to which the word led them. Hence he says, "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." (I. Thess. 2: 13.) He says their faith and charity and hope and labor of love were remarkably famous throughout the

country round about. He says that he and the other apostles walked "HOLILY, justly, and unblamably" among them, and that they "became FOLLOWERS of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction [sore persecutions], with joy of the Holy Ghost." (I. Thess. 1: 6.)

9. It is very clear that they had not only received and adopted all the doctrines Paul had preached to them, but actually walked in HOLINESS, FOLLOWING the example of the holy apostles AND OF THE LORD JESUS. His example surely was one of holiness. Paul declares they became his followers, and "were ENSAMPLES [patterns] to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia." (I. Thess. 1: 7.) Hence we conclude that,

10. Paul prayed not that they might for the first time become sanctified, but that the whole church, including the "UNRULY" ones, might be sanctified. He desired them ALL to enjoy the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. The unruly NEEDED it. Hence he fitly says, "The very God of peace sanctify you WHOLLY;" that is, the whole church as a body. This language no more implies that they were all unsanctified, and had never been sanctified, than the prayer of Jesus, "Sanctify them through thy truth" (John 17: 17), implies that his disciples had never been sanctified. He had, on that same evening and during

that same interview, said, "Now ye are clean." Yet after this he prays, "Sanctify them."

11. Paul says, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." John Wesley says, "Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life, this is the whole of Christian perfection." (C. P., page 22.) These two statements are perfectly harmonious. Well, the brethren at Thessalonica were not in need of instruction on this point; for Paul declares, "But as touching brotherly love ye need not that I write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another. And indeed ye do it toward all the brethren which are in all Macedonia." (I. Thess. 4: 9, 10.) This settles the question. The church at Thessalonica was, as a whole, sound and correct both in doctrine and in practice. Both the apostles with the word, and God with his Spirit had taught them that Christian perfection consists in a heart full of God's love. Paul declares they knew this, and practiced accordingly. They had received this doctrine in power and demonstration of the Spirit. Their faith, their love, their labor, their charity, and their godly example were remarkable and famous. No man can read this epistle without noticing these facts, for a large portion of it consists in Paul's eulogiums and congratulations over them.

11. SCRIPTURE.—*John* 17: 17.

"*Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.*"

The theologians under review lay the stress on the words "*sanctify them.*" They hold that the apostles needed sanctification; that they had never been sanctified; for if they had the Savior would have found no occasion for the prayer, "Sanctify them." The argument they pretend to draw from this text is precisely of the same character as that which they pretend to draw from the text which we last noticed (10. SCRIPTURE.—*I. Thess.* 5: 23. "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly.") Let us honestly and earnestly look to God for wisdom, and earnestly and honestly look at this text, "comparing scripture with scripture." Let us carefully note the following scriptural FACTS:

1. It is common for the Savior and his apostles to exhort and command persons to do things which they had already done.

2. If we carefully look into the third chapter of Paul's letter to the Colossians, we shall find several instances of this kind:

(1) "*Set your affection on things above.*" (Verse 2.)

Can any one suppose that persons could have become "meet [fit] for the inheritance of the

saints in light," and "complete in Him" (Christ) as these brethren were, (see Colossians 1: 12, and 2: 10, 11,) without having their affection set on things above? The supposition would be utterly repugnant to all Bible truth and Christian experience. No Christian is able to believe it. It is absolutely certain that they had their affection firmly fixed on "the hope which was laid up for them in heaven." (Col. 1: 5.) Yet the apostle, fully aware of this fact, exhorts them to "set their affection on things above."

(2) "*Mortify your members.*" (Col. 3: 5.)

Had they not done this? Were they not still doing so? Certainly they had and were; for he says (Col. 2: 11), "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ;" also Col. 3: 9, "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds."

Does the objector say, "Paul wished them to continue mortifying their members?" I answer, Precisely so; and so did the Savior request the Father to continue sanctifying them—that is, keeping them sanctified who were already pure.

(3) "*Put off anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth.*" (Col. 3: 8.)

Can we imagine that these brethren were still

indulging "anger, wrath, and malice" toward one another, since the apostle says, "We give thanks to God, * * since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the LOVE which ye have to all the saints. * * * Epaphras * * declared unto us your LOVE in the Spirit." (Col. 1: 3, 4, 7, 8.)

None deny that the Colossians were sanctified. Yet if we should apply the principle of interpretation to Paul's language here last quoted which the double-birth theologians apply to our text and to the one preceding it (10), and to several other scriptures which we shall yet notice, we should conclude that the Colossian brethren were still continuing in the indulgence of "MALICE" and "BLASPHEMY"—a thought which is too shocking for a moment's entertainment. Again he exhorts them:

(4) "*Put on mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness.*" (Col. 3: 12.)

Are we to suppose that they were still UNKIND, PROUD, IRRITABLE, and UNMERCIFUL; that is, REVENGEFUL? To this conclusion the apostle's language would inevitably lead us if we should apply to it the second-work rule of interpretation. Under the dominancy of their rule we should say, "How could the apostle exhort the Colossians to put on these graces if they had already put them on? He

could not with any consistency. Therefore the Colossians were full of PRIDE, MALICE, and REVENGE —the ugliest of all passions. Surely they needed the second work." This would be just such reasoning as they apply to our text, to I. Thess. 5 23; John 15: 2; Eph. 5: 26; Eph. 4. 23, and II Cor. 7: 1.

Dr. Wood says, "All these passages have reference to Christians who are in a regenerate state, but not entirely sanctified; and these scriptures imply or teach that their entire sanctification had not yet been wrought." (P. L., page 15.)

There is not any more reason for saying that "all these passages have reference to unsanctified Christians," than there is for saying that the Colossians were unsanctified; because Paul exhorts them to put off the worst of vices and put on the commonest Christian virtues. If Paul's prayer, "God sanctify you wholly," and the Savior's prayer, "Sanctify them through thy truth," "imply or teach that their [the persons to whom they had reference] entire sanctification had not yet been wrought," then Paul's language to the Colossians implies or teaches that they had not yet put off "anger, wrath, malice, revenge, and blasphemy," nor "put on humility, mercy, meekness, or kindness." Yet he speaks in the highest terms of their brotherly love, and also declares, "Ye have put

off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, * * wherein * * Christ is all and in all." He also calls them "HOLY AND BELOVED." They were holy, loving, a d beloved Christians.

This same apostle, in his letter to the church at Rome, says, "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 13: 14.) On the principle of interpretation adopted by these second-work theologians, we should here conclude that the church at Rome had never put on Christ prior to the writing of Paul's letter to them as Christians, in which he says, "Being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." (Rom. 6: 22.) Here he says they are pure and holy. Yet at a later point in the same letter he exhorts them to put on Christ. How are we to understand him, seeing that no one can become a Christian without putting on Christ? Thus: In all cases of this kind we are to understand the apostle simply in the attitude of the gospel glass and the gospel rule side by side before his pupil's face and eyes, so that they shall know of a certainty what a Christian is, and whether they fill the bill or not. He leaves no pupil in a quandery.

3. If we turn now to John 15: 3, we shall find that these apostles for whom Jesus prayed "sanc-

tify them," were already sanctified. Jesus said, "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." "NOW YE ARE CLEAN." If Jesus did not misrepresent their state, they were clean, pure, sanctified, holy. And it was on that same evening of the Passover in which these words, "Now ye are clean," were uttered, and in the same room where they eat that feast, or possibly on their way from that room toward Gethsemane, that Jesus uttered the prayer in our text, "Sanctify them through thy truth." This much is absolutely certain: The prayer was offered subsequently to the declaration, "Now ye are clean." If then they were in need of a cleansing, a sanctifying, a deliverance from "inbred pollution," it was not because they had never been sanctified, but because they had backslidden. It is not at all probable that they had backslidden quite so soon—although Peter certainly did backslide far enough to lie three times and to curse and swear that same night. (Matt. 26: 74.)

There is no probability, however, that either of the eleven who were present when Jesus said, "Ye are clean," fell into sin before he uttered the prayer on the way to the garden. Judas was not in their company at either time. He had gone on his errand of mischief to inform the priests that his Lord would soon be in the garden, where they

might seize him unobserved by the multitude. And if they had backslidden, and were consequently in need of sanctification, then the text affords no evidence in the case; for the doctrine under review says there must be a second change, another spiritual birth after the first, and prior to all backslidings, before a clean heart can be obtained.

4. Thus we see that whether we suppose they had backslidden or that they had not, the text affords not the least evidence in the case.

5. On the supposition that they had not backslidden in two or three hours after Jesus pronounced them clean, the text affords an instance of the Savior's praying for a blessing upon his apostles which they were already enjoying. He prayed for their cleansing when he knew they were clean. Here was a precedent for the apostles, which they and millions of others have followed. Thus we hear Paul praying, "Grace be unto you, and peace rom God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Col. 1: 2), when, as every one knows, they were in the full enjoyment of both grace and peace. "And this I pray, * * that ye may approve things that are excellent." (Phil. 1: 10.) Are we to suppose that they did not already "approve things that were excellent?" Surely they approved the gospel, the plan of sal-

vation, its excellent author, and his holy apostles. Yet Paul "prays that they might approve things that are excellent."

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." (I. Thess. 5: 28.) Are we to believe that his grace was not already with them? Surely regenerate persons have grace enough to keep them from sin. This is agreed to on all hands."

"The God of peace sanctify you wholly." (I. Thess. 5: 23.) We have seen that at least some of these Thessalonians were sanctified. And if we had not, yet it would now be sufficiently clear that since the Savior's precedent the apostle might, in strictest propriety, pray for the sanctification of persons already sanctified.

6. We have been told by the theologians of the second-work theory that the prayer in our text had its first answer at Pentecost; that "Jesus desired his apostles to tarry at Jerusalem till the roots of bitterness were taken out of them and their hearts were made clean."

(1) But we have seen that their hearts were clean on the night of the betrayal.

(2) We know too that it was for an entirely different purpose that they were to tarry at Jerusalem. Jesus commanded them thus: "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be indued with power from on high." (Luke 24: 49.)

(3) More power is what they needed. Power is what they waited for. Power is what they prayed for, day and night, for the space of about ten days. Power is what they obtained on the blessed Christian Sabbath. On that blessed Lord's-day morning, the inaugural of the gospel dispensation, the Christian Sabbath, there was such a manifestation of Holy-Ghost power, in all the distinctive characteristics of that Almighty Embodiment of all excellency and loveliness as earth had never seen.

(1) On that blessed first day of the week, first day of the inaugurated gospel dispensation, first day of visibly-attested (with forked flames) Holy-Ghost power, God's gospel ministers were fully prepared for the work before them.

(2) They were also prepared for the terrible opposition they were to meet.

(3) This preparation was given in the midst of a very fine opportunity for work. There were probably not less than three millions of persons present. Many nations and countries were represented by persons who carried home the tidings of the extraordinary phenomena and events.

4) The power in and with the extraordinary opportunity, and with the burning love for Jesus and his kingdom and immortal

souls, set them to work in demonstration of the Spirit and with power.

(5) The Spirit showed them how he would certainly and powerfully enforce his own truth in the hearts and consciences of its hearers.

(6) Every Christian, by asking, may have all the power he needs, to resist temptation, to bear trials, afflictions, persecutions, troubles, and crosses.

(7) More power should be one of the objects of each Christian's constant solicitude and prayer.

12. SCRIPTURE.—*Rom.* 12: 1, 2.

"I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be no conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God."

1. This has sometimes been quoted in support of the assumption that the Roman brethren had never made a full consecration of themselves to God, and that therefore they had not proved the perfect will of God in obtaining sanctification.

2. It is also assumed that Paul here teaches the sanctification of the body. To these propositions we reply,

1. Doubtless Paul assumes the doctrine of the sanctification of the body.

2. John Wesley, quoting the passage, in a sermon on Christian perfection, drops out the words "holy, acceptable."

3. I shall not inquire into his motive; but it is obvious to every one that Paul, in the text, requires the presentation of a holy body, and not of a sinful, polluted body to have it made holy. "Present your bodies holy," is the exhortation.

4. If then the body must be holy on presentation, it can not be presented for the purpose of having it purified and made holy.

5. Hence there is not the least evidence in the text that their bodies were not already holy, but the contrary.

6. If their bodies were holy, surely their souls were; for their souls would be sanctified on the same conditions that their bodies were.

7. It is absolutely certain that the Roman brethren had been made free from sin. Paul declares, "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." (Rom. 6: 22.)

The apostle makes no distinction here between inward and outward sin. He reckons all together, and says, "Ye are made free from sin." This in-

cludes all sin. Then, "Ye have your fruit unto holiness." Holy fruit can only proceed from holy hearts. Hence their hearts were holy. "A corrupt tree can not bring forth good fruit." They brought forth good fruit, "*holy fruit*," therefore we must conclude they WERE HOLY. "Free from sin," and "fruit unto holiness," are expressions which can characterize none but the pure and holy. They were not "carnal, sold under sin," but "free from sin."

13. SCRIPTURE.—*I. Cor.* 3 : 1–3.

"And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. Ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?"

There is no other text so much relied on as this by the double-birth theologians for evidence in support of their doctrine. It is the first one quoted by Dr. J. A. Wood, in his "Perfect Love," to prove that sanctification does not occur at the time of regeneration. It is the first one of several passages concerning which he says, "All these passages have reference to Christians who are in a regenerate state, but not entirely sanctified; and these scriptures imply or teach that their

entire sanctification had not yet been wrought." (Page 15.)

It is used with the utmost confidence by Bishop Castle in his elaborate answer to the question, "Can a man be born of God without being sanctified?" His entire comment on our text in that article is as follows: "The question, 'are ye not carnal, and walk as men?' may well be asked of many modern Christians, in view of the disaffection that exists upon the part of one toward another. It will hardly do to say that they were not in a state of grace; for they are written to as being in the relation of 'babes in Christ.' In Christ and yet carnal. Could they be holy while in this condition? One charge made against them most clearly indicates a soul-condition that does not comport with entire sanctification. They had 'envying' among them. The apostle would say that they were sinful in thought, in word, and in deed." (*Tel.*, June 19, 1878.)

1. The first question to be considered is, Were these Corinthians ALL CHRISTIANS? The bishop assumes that they were. All who use the text in the interest of that doctrine must assume that they were all Christians; ALL in the regenerate state; for if they were either unconverted or backslidden, either in whole or in part, then they are no witnesses in the case.

2. WERE THEY ALL CHRISTIANS?

(1) If they were, then a sinner is a Christian, for Paul attributes to them—at least some of them —1. A want of spirituality. 2. Carnality. 3. Envy. 4. Strife. 5. Division. Can men indulge all these and yet be Christians? Surely not. Envy is among the ugliest dispositions the human heart can indulge. No one can indulge it whose heart is not full of the love of the world; and John declares, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." (I. John 2: 15.) Surely no man is a Christian who is destitute of "the love of the Father." Envy is inseparably connected with the love of the world; and this is incompatible with the love of God. But the love of God is shed abroad in the heart of every justified soul by the Holy Ghost. (Rom. 5: 1, 2.) Envy includes enmity against its object. This is what produced the "*strife among*" them. There can be no strife where there is no enmity. And enmity is the very reverse of love. Surely all disciples of Christ have hearts full of brotherly love. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another." Brotherly love is the invariable evidence of discipleship. It is an invariable characteristic of a child of God. But it is certain that some of them were destitute of brotherly love. Hence we know they were not

Christians. They were church-members, but not Christians.

(2) If they were all Christians, then Paul was mistaken either when he attributed carnality to them, or else when he said, in his letter to the Romans. (Rom. 8: 7, 8.) "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God."

Some of the church-members at Corinth were carnal. They were possessed of the carnal mind. The carnal mind can not be subject to the law of God, therefore they were not subject to the law of God. But all Christians are subject to the law of God. John Wesley says, "Even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin." Hence we see that these carnal, sinful, rebellious Corinthians were not Christians.

(3) God surely can not justify those who displease him. "They that are in the flesh can not please God." The carnal are in the flesh. These Corinthians were in the flesh. Therefore we must conclude that they were not Christians. They pleased not God.

(4) Even Bishop Castle says they were sinners. Not only a few, but all of them are under his accusation as sinners. As we noticed above, he says "the apostle would say that they were sinful in

thought, in word, and in deed." There is no other way that men can be sinful, besides thought, word, and deed. If the bishop is half correct in his description of their moral character, then there must have been at least some sinners among them; some who were unworthy the name Christian according to Mr. Wesley's standard that "even babes in Christ do not commit sin."

(5) "Without charity I am nothing." (No Christian.) "Charity envieth not." They envied. They had not charity, and were not Christians.

(6) If some of them were over sinners,—which is a fact beyond all reasonable doubt,—(see text, and 5: 1)—then it can not be true that they were all in the regenerate state. And if they were not all in the regenerate state, then the second-work theologians have not a shadow of title to their case as evidence in the matter before us. If they were not all in the regenerate state, without any exception, and without any backsliding,—as these theologians assume,—then there can be no evidence drawn from their case in support of the doctrine that the soul is not made pure in regeneration; and it is a bold abuse of Paul to say that he ever meant to teach such a doctrine.

3. Having now proved that there were backslidden, sinful church-members at Corinth, we proceed to notice that there were also holy, sanc-

tified brethren in that church. In the sixteenth and seventeenth verses of this same chapter in which our text is recorded, Paul says, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy, for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."

The following points are made very clear in these two verses:

1. A human soul may be a temple of God. "YE ARE the temple of God."

2. God is very much displeased with a defiled human soul that has sufficient intelligence to be accountable.

3. Therefore such a soul can not enjoy peace with God.

4. Such a soul is in the way of destruction. "Him shall God destroy."

5. That God dwells not in an unholy temple. "The temple of God is holy." The defiled are not his abode, but objects of his indignation.

6. That some of the Corinthians were positively holy. "The temple of God is holy, which temple YE ARE."

In further proof of this point see I. Cor. 6: 11, where Paul says, "And such were some of you: but YE ARE WASHED, but YE ARE SANCTIFIED, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

They were sanctified "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Titus 3: 5.)

4. Thus it is made clear beyond all reasonable doubt that Paul, in his letters to the Corinthians, was consciously addressing two classes of persons; namely, backsliders and Christians. The backsliders were carnal; the Christians were, as all Christians are, pure in heart; holy temples of God, "SANCTIFIED."

5. But Paul addressed the visible body of believers as one body—as a whole church. As such they were not free from carnality and sin; for there was "AMONG them envy, strife, and division." But it is a slander on God to say that he can justify a soul in the indulgence of these vices. The persons "AMONG" them who did this (indulgence) were exceptional cases. Doubtless the majority of them were holy, sanctified temples of God; and as such Paul addresses them in the passages cited (3: 16, 17; 6: 11). Their case is no evidence in the matter before us.

14. SCRIPTURE.—*II. Cor.* 7: 1.

"*Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.*"

1. If the Corinthians were all unsanctified

when Paul wrote this text, it is certain that there had been a woful falling away among them which carried with it all who had not already backslidden before he wrote the first letter.

2. This is exceedingly improbable; for such an event would have so completely demoralized and ruined the church there that Paul would not have considered it worth the while to write them at all; much less would he have addressed them with the endearing title, "brethren" (8: 1); and still less would he have "boasted of their charity to the church at Macedonia." (9: 2.)

3. But it is certain that there were backslidden, worldly-minded, self-conceited church-members among them. In proof of this, see remarks on "13. SCRIPTURE," and Paul's reference to those among them, who, in the haughtiness of their self-conceit declared that Paul, the mighty apostle, was carnal and contemptible. (See 10: 2, 10.) "I think to be bold against some who think of us as if we walked according to the flesh. * * For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible." See also I. Cor. 5: 1, 5, 7, 13, "It is commonly reported that there is * * among you, and such * * * as is not so much as named among the gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. * * Deliver such a one

unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. * * Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, [such wicked, backslidden persons,] that ye may be [entirely] a new lump, as ye are [a large majority of you] unleavened. * * Put away from among yourselves that wicked person."

In I. Cor. 3: 1st, 2nd, and the 5th chapter entire, and in II. Cor. 10: 2, 10, we are furnished with indisputable evidence that there were backslidden, wicked church-members at Corinth. In I. Cor. 3: 16, 17; 5: 7; 6: 11; and II. Cor. 6: 16; 9: 2, we are furnished with indisputable evidence that there were holy, sanctified, charitable Christians there. But no man can find a scrap of evidence in either of these epistles in support of the assumption that there was a class of unsanctified, regenerate persons there. How utterly groundless, then, must be the assumption that the brethren at Corinth were all in an unsanctified, regenerate state. Hence there is no evidence in our text, nor in any other text in these epistles, in support of the double-birth doctrine.

OUR TEXT, in connection with the preceding chapter, presents the following:

1. The promises of God are ample evidence that he will sustain and support his children in a

complete a perfect separation from all customs, practices, principles, associations, and alliances which are in any way or in any degree inconsistent with perfect purity of soul and body.

2. That holiness takes hold of, directs, and controls the physical man as well as the spiritual. It brings the appetites, passions, and propensities of the flesh into sweet acquiescence with God's perfect law of love,—pure love to God and man,—as really and as thoroughly as it does the affections, desires, motives, wishes, aspirations, and thoughts of the spirit.

But Paul never taught that there could be such a thing as imperfect holiness, nor that man can perfect holiness. Holiness in man is always the product of the Holy-Ghost energy. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." (Tit. 3: 5, 6.)

15. SCRIPTURE.—*I. Peter* 1: 16.

"*Be ye holy; for I am holy.*"

Dr. J. A Wood, in his "Perfect Love," page 15, says, "Do the Scriptures assume a distinction between regeneration and entire sanctification?

They do. To sinners God says, 'Ye must be born again.' To the regenerate he says, 'Be ye holy; for I am holy.' These two classes of commands, in their various forms, are prominent through all the Gospels and Epistles.' "

1. It seems a great pity that the doctor was not pleased to inform us how he found out that the command, "Be ye holy," is not addressed to every moral being. If he had been pleased to give us reliable evidence in support of his proposition, he would have accomplished what no other man ever did or ever will; and thereby he would have forever settled this whole question. If there exist the two classes of commands, and addressed to two classes of persons, which, the doctor says, "are prominent through all the Gospels and Epistles," no man could by any possibility render better service to his race than by elucidating the fact; for if this second-work doctrine were true, it would be the most important doctrine imaginable.

2. The doctor's abundant ability to appreciate the theological value of the two classes of scriptures whose existence he affirms, would surely have moved him to collect at least a few specimens for the public good, and given us at least one of the scripture evidences which convinced him that the command, "Be ye holy," is addressed exclusively to "the regenerate."

The doctor well knew that he could give neither; so he gives us instead a much cheaper article—namely, his *ipse dixit* and that of other men fallible as himself, as found in a church-creed, a church hymn-book and parasitic authors. He seems to have forgotten that the sacred Scriptures must settle this great question, or else he wished others to forget it and content themselves with beggarly assumptions instead of evidence.

3. Jesus said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these." (Luke 10: 27; Mark 12: 31.)

(1) These commandments are addressed to ALL men everywhere; for they are "the first commandments." (Mark 12: 30. See also I. Tim. 1: 9, 10. Law is for the wicked.)

(2) They require perfect holiness; for "there there is none other commandment greater than these."

(3) They require perfection of moral character; for "on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." (Matt. 22: 40.) Surely holiness is required somewhere in "the law and prophets;" for "the end of the commandment is

charity out of a PURE HEART, and of a good conscience, and of a faith unfeigned." (I. Tim. 1: 5.)

(4) These commands require holiness by requiring "love to God supremely and love to man subordinately." (Thomas Dick.) "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. * * And if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying—namely, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' Love worketh no ill to his neighbor. Therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. 13: 8–10.)

(5) If Mr. Wesley, the father of the double-birth doctrine, is correct in his declaration, "Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life, this is the whole of Christian perfection," (C. P., page 22), then he who obeys these two commands, which are undeniably addressed to all mankind, will be a perfect a Christian.

4. That Dr. Wood committed a very grave blunder in the use of our text is placed beyond all reasonable doubt by the learned and inspired apostle when he says,

"The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, * * for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars, for per-

jured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust." (I. Tim. 1: 9--11.)

(1) It can not be claimed that this refers exclusively to the ceremonial law, or anything else in the old dispensation; for it refers to "everything that is contrary to sound doctrine, according to the GOSPEL."

(2) All God's law is addressed to all men.

(3) All his law includes all his commands.

(4) Hence the command, "Be ye holy," is addressed to ALL men, without any exception.

OBJECTION 25.

THE SACRED SCRIPTURES ARE DIRECTLY AGAINST IT.

SCRIPTURE 1.—*James* 2: 10.

"*Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.*"

1. It is agreed on all hands that a justified person is not a guilty person.

2. It is admitted on all hands that every disobedient person is a guilty person. And our text declares that disobedience in one item involves all guilt. It is the whole indivisible soul of the creature against the whole indivisible will of the Creator.

3. There are several commands in God's word which can not be obeyed without becoming or bei ing holy.

(1) "*Be ye holy.*" (I. Peter 1: 16.) No one can obey this without becoming holy. Remaining unholy, he remains in disobedience and guilt. In guilt, he is not justified, but condemned; not a Christian.

(2) "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.*" (Mark 12: 20.) No one will deny that this is addressed to every accountable member of the human family. Certain it is that no unholy heart can obey it. Equally certain it is that no accountable member of the race can be justified until the moment when he commences obedience. The justification of a heart in disobedience would be the inaugural of anarchy. Hence we see that God never pronounces a soul just till it is in perfect harmony with all the requirements of this holy command. And this involves Christian perfection.

(3) "*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*" (Mark 12: 31.) No one can be justified till he comes into a state of harmony and obedience to this holy command. And no one can do this without coming into harmony with all God's law. "For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.

* * If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Rom. 13: 8, 9.) Thus Paul recognizes the fact that the soul which harmonizes with this commandment also harmonizes with all the requirements of God's law. And every man knows that this involves holiness, —Christian perfection; for holiness is its central requirement, the embodiment of all its requirements.

(4) "*Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.*" (Matt. 5: 48.)

a. We must not forget that this is a positive command addressed to every accountable individual; for "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, * * and for everything that is contrary to sound doctrine, according to the glorious gospel." (I. Timothy 1: 9–11.)

b. Nor may we forget that all disobedience involes guilt; and all guilt holds the soul under condemnation, excluding justification.

c. So we see clearly that whoever falls short of obedience to this holy commandment of the ever-blessed King of glory must be reckoned as a disobedient, condemned sinner. "Whosoever offendeth in one point is guilty of all." (See our text.)

d. Of course, the perfection required is not an

infallible intellect, nor an unfailing muscle, but MORAL PURITY; purity of WILL from purposes of rebellion; purity of MOTIVE, the glory of God; purity of AFFECTION, delighting only in that which is right, IN MORAL BEAUTY; purity of DESIRE, indulging no wrong aspiration, nor an appetite in a wrong way or to a wrong extent. IT IS MORAL BEAUTY.

e. No power but that of the Holy Ghost can bring the soul into this heavenly state, or keep it so. But he is abundantly able; and when the soul surrenders its entire being, powers, and possessions into his hands, trusting in the merits of Jesus' blood, he is abundantly WILLING, and DOES it. For this let earth and heaven praise him forever.

f. But let us not forget that the only escape from condemnation is in Christian perfection, as required by the holy command, "*Be ye perfect.*"

(5) "*Be filled with the Spirit.*" (Eph. 5: 18.)

a. Here is a positive command.

b. Disobedience and condemnation are inseparable. Sanctified persons fall swiftly into condemnation in the very moment of disobedience.

c. Obedience to this command involves Christian perfection.

d. Thus, we see, the only escape from condemnation is in Christian perfection; "for the fruit of

the Spirit is in *all* [in whom he dwells] *righteousness.*" (Eph. 5: 9.) Righteousness is holiness. Wherever the Spirit dwells he produces holiness.

(6) "*Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh.*" (Gal. 5: 16.) Disobedience to this command produces and perpetuates guilt. Obedience delivers from the carnal mind; that is, sanctifies and keeps clean. Condemnation or sanctification is the only alternative.

A CONCESSION agreeing with the remarks on the last two scriptures quoted is found in Dr. Wood's "Perfect Love," page 244. He says, "Is the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or being filled with the Spirit, the blessing of holiness? It includes it. To be 'full of the Holy Ghost,' 'full of faith and the Holy Ghost,' 'full of faith and power,' and to be 'filled with all the fullness of God,' is to possess full salvation or perfect love. To be 'filled with all the fullness of God' is, however, much more than merely to be sanctified." These are just remarks, and lead to the conclusion that to "be filled with the Spirit," or to be "baptized with the Holy Ghost," is to be sanctified. The doctor justly uses the expressions, "Baptism of the Holy Ghost," and, "Filled with the Spirit," synonymously. So he does all those similar expressions above quoted. Hence his remarks are in precise harmony with the remarks on the two scriptures

above. But they are surely inconsistent with his doctrine of the "second work," as we shall now more fully see.

SCRIPTURE 2.—*I. Cor.* 12: 13.

"*By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body; * * and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.*"

1. Here it is placed beyond all reasonable doubt that it is by the work of the Holy Spirit that men are "delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son" (Col. 1: 13), into the mystic "body of Christ," "the family of God in heaven and on earth," "saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Titus 3: 5, 6) at conversion.

2. This work of the Spirit in bringing the sinner out of Satan's family into the family of God is, in our text, as elsewhere, called a baptism. "Baptized into one body." This is the way all Christians come to be Christians. "*Baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*" "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple; * * he is like a refiner's fire and like fullers' soap." (Mal. 3: 1, 2.)

3. Well, the baptism of the Holy Ghost sanc-

tifies the soul. On this we all agree. (See text.) And Paul, in our text, makes it indisputable that the soul is brought into the family of God by a Holy-Ghost baptism. By this baptism it is regenerated, "born of water and of the Spirit;" that is, born of the Spirit by its cleansing power, refined and purified like silver by the "baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire; that is, regenerated by the refining, purifying, zeal-inflaming, and witnessing power of the Holy Spirit.

4. Thus it is an indisputable fact that the soul is sanctified by a Holy-Ghost baptism, and made pure as snow in the moment of regeneration.

SCRIPTURE 3.—*Rom.* 8: 9.

"*Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.*"

1. "The flesh" here is the selfish, depraved, carnal state of the fallen soul. To be in the flesh is to be in an unholy state, as all agree.

2. To be in the Spirit is, as all agree, to be in the reverse or opposite state from the carnal.

3. The central idea expressed in the text is the fact that all who have the Spirit of God dwelling in them are not in the fallen, depraved carnal state. "If the Spirit of God dwell in you, then

ye are not in the flesh"—the carnal state,—but the opposite.

4. It is a settled point that all Christians have the Spirit of God dwelling in them; for "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body."

5. So, then, it is indisputably true that all Christians have the Spirit of God dwelling in them; that all who have this are free from carnality; that all who are thus free are pure, sanctified, holy. All Christians, therefore, are holy. There is no such being as an unholy Christian. LET NO ONE CALL HIMSELF A CHRISTIAN WHOSE HEART IS NOT IN PERFECT HARMONY WITH ALL GOD'S LAW.

SCRIPTURE 4.—*Gal.* 2: 20.

"I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God."

On these words Mr. Wesley remarks, "Words that manifestly describe a deliverance from inward as well as from outward sin. This is expressed both negatively, 'I live not,'—my evil nature, the body of sin, is destroyed,—and positively, 'Christ liveth in me,' and therefore all that is holy and

just and good. Indeed, both these, 'Christ liveth in me,' and, 'I live not,' are inseparably connected; for what communion hath light with darkness, or Christ with Belial?" (C. P., page 6.)

When Mr. Wesley penned these words he wrote like a theologian. They are worthy the pen of any theologian that ever wrote. They are especially worthy of our confidence and serious consideration as coming from the eminent Father of the double-birth theology. Surely he would make no statements contrary both to the sacred word and to his favorite doctrine, especially when, as in this case, he was writing specifically on that doctrine. But nothing can be clearer than the fact that the statements are utterly inconsistent with his favorite doctrine. But he had his eye only on one phase of his doctrine, forgetting all others, or he would surely have suppressed his thoughts in our text, or else he would have abandoned his doctrine; for his doctrine admits, he admits, all his followers admit, and God's word most clearly teaches, that he dwells in the heart of every regenerate person. Well, if this be admitted, and Mr. Wesley's reasoning on our text be admitted, then we are carried inevitably to the conclusion that every regenerate soul is sanctified. He says,

(1. "Words that manifestly describe a deliver-

ance from inward as well as outward sin." This includes all sin.

(2. "'I live not.' My evil nature, the body of sin, is destroyed." This brings the soul to Mr. Wesley's idea of perfect purity, and no mistake.

(3. "'Christ liveth in me,' and therefore all that is holy and just and good." [Lives in me.] "All the fullness of God."

(4. "Indeed, both these, 'Christ liveth in me,' and, 'I live not,' are inseparably connected; for what communion hath light with darkness, or Christ with Belial?"

a. First, Mr. Wesley informs us that Paul affirms his complete moral purity and holiness.

b. Then he points us to the apostle's evidence of the glorious fact. This evidence, he says, consists in two inseparable facts; namely, (1) "I live not;" (2) "Christ liveth in me."

c. If it be true, as Mr. Wesley says, that these two facts "are inseparably connected," then it must be true, beyond all doubt, that whenever Christ lives in a soul, that soul is dead to sin and alive to holiness. Why could not Mr. Wesley understand that the same cause—an indwelling Christ—would produce the same effect—holiness, in all other cases as well as that of Paul? Who can tell?

SCRIPTURE 5.—*John* 8: 36.

"*If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.*" "*The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.* * * * *Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.*" (*II. Cor.* 3: 6, 17.) "*For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.*" (*Rom.* 8: 2.)

1. Here is a liberty—a freedom—spoken of.

2. This liberty is freedom from sin in every sense of the word.

3. This liberty or freedom from sin is always produced by "the Spirit of life."

4. "Wherever the Spirit of the Lord is [dwells in the heart] there is liberty.

Wherever he dwells in a heart, he forthwith sets it free. Bondage to sin is utterly inconsistent with his indwelling presence. He will not dwell approvingly in any heart where he can not have things in his own way. Wherever he has his own way sin is entirely absent.

5. As we have repeatedly noticed, this Spirit of life dwells in every regenerate heart. On this point all agree.

6. Thus again we are borne irresistibly to the conclusion that every regenerate heart is free and

pure from sin. "*Whom the Son maketh free they are free indeed.*" God's great plan of salvation, as revealed in his word, knows nothing about half freedom. It recognizes bondage in the sinner and freedom in the Christian. One is Satan's slave, the other is Christ's free man. Let no lip utter the slander on my Redeemer that he ever half liberates a soul, leaving the other half in satanic bondage. It is too vile a caricature of his glorious work and his all-glorious character.

SCRIPTURE 6.—*Rom.* 8: 17.

"*And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.*" "*He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.*" (*Titus* 3: 5–7.)

1. Here we find that justification and regeneration occur at the same moment. On this we are all agreed.

2. Here we also find that heirship to eternal life commences at the moment of regeneration. "If children, then heirs." "That being

justified we should be made heirs." On this all agree.

3. This heirship entitles to eternal life in heaven. "Heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

4. This heirship to God,—to God's estate and the enjoyment of his presence at his home,—this title, is a good one. It holds; for it is a joint-title with that of Christ. His title is valid. Every child of God has one just as valid; for it is incorporated with his. This is good enough.

5. To the actual occupancy of the estate to which every child of God is an heir and holds a title, there a solitary condition—only one. That condition is simply clinging to the title as it is. "Joint-heirs with Christ; *if so be* that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together."

"*If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel.*" (Col. 1: 23.) The only "*if*" is in regard to perseverance. "*He that endureth to the end shall be saved.*" (Jesus.)

6. If the final occupancy of the estate were suspended on any other condition besides the one mentioned in our text, surely Paul would have mentioned it in the same connection. Nothing could be more important. But he has not done

so anywhere. If the second work—the "instantaneous deliverance after justification"—be an indispensable prerequisite to fitness for the occupancy of the mansion in heaven, then Paul committed an omission of the gravest character, not only in his letters to Rome and to Titus, but in all his letters, for he never mentions it once.

7. It is a grave impeachment of the justice of God to say that he bestows a legal title to a home in heaven upon a soul so full of corruption that he is utterly unfit to occupy it. He never can do such work.

8. Mark you: the title is "in accordance with the hope of eternal life." Can any one hope for eternal life in heavenly felicity with a heart full of corruption? It would be madness of presumption. Only "the pure in heart shall see God." How then can this heirship be "according to the hope of eternal life," when bestowed on a polluted soul? The supposition is simply absurd.

9. Since, then, the Scriptures plainly declare that every regenerate soul is an heir of God, and of heaven,—for God is greater than heaven; since they plainly teach that every regenerate soul is in actual possession of and communion with the holy, the lofty One, who inhabits eternity and the hearts and praises of all his children, declaring, "I will dwell in them and walk in them;" since this

heirship is conferred only in accordance with the "hope of eternal life;" since no one can rationally hope to enjoy that eternal life without a clean heart; since it is utterly inconsistent with all rational ideas of God's justice to suppose that he can bestow a title to a holy inheritance upon a being who is "full of sin," "carnal, sold under sin," and consequently utterly unfit for the occupancy and enjoyment of that inheritance; therefore we should do violence to all reason, common sense, the sacred Scriptures, and the honor of God, to suppose that he ever did or ever will bestow such a title apart from the fitness. THE TITLE WITHOUT THE FITNESS WOULD BE ENTIRELY USELESS AND A MERE SHAM.

SCRIPTURE 7.—*I. John* 4: 12.

"*If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us.*"

1. According to Mr. Wesley, and according to the entire New Testament, Christian perfection consists in "PURE LOVE REIGNING IN THE HEART." On this we all agree

2. According to our text, this pure love reigning in the heart is evinced by two items; namely, 1. "*Brotherly love,*" and 2. "*God dwelling in us.*"

3. Both these begin at the moment of regeneration. On this there is no dispute. The Scriptures most positively affirm it, and our opponents do not deny it. Paul says with undisputed reference to every justified soul, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us." (Rom. 5: 5.) Mr. Wesley quotes this with reference to every justified soul. (Christian Perfection, page 9.)

This one passage clearly shows that both God and his love take possession of the heart at the moment of conversion. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." "And it is the Spirit that beareth witness." (I. John 5: 8, 10.) This shows the living God in every true believer in Jesus. "God is love." Therefore, whenever he dwells in a heart, that heart is full of love. "Every one that loveth him that begot, loveth him also that is begotten of him." (I. John 5: 1.) This puts it beyond all dispute that every regenerate person loves all others.

4. Thus it is obvious that our text alone sets this whole question at rest with all who carefully consider it. "If we love one another [which all regenerate persons do, then] God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us." This love is Christian perfection. Thus Christian perfection dwells in every child of God. God has no imper-

fect children. It seems passing strange that learned theologians could see so clearly that perfect love is Christian perfection, but could not see that every child of God has this perfect love, when it is so clearly taught that their hearts were filled with it in the first moment of their heirship in God's family. It is by the transfusion of this love with himself, who is love throughout the entire texture and substance of the soul, that God regenerates it. Its perfection in love is the inevitable consequence. As surely as Adam begat sons in his own likeness, so surely does God beget sons in his own likeness.

SCRIPTURE 8.—*I. John* 1: 5–7.

"*God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.*"

Here is one of the richest and most interesting passages in the Bible of God. It is at the same time one of the most simple and lucid passages anywhere to be found. Many errorists have trembled in its presence as a lamb would tremble in the presence of a lion. Here the conscientious

seekers of truth, in contemplation of its richness, almost

"Tremble with fullness of joy."

We can not now attend to all the points of interest, but only those which are strictly apposite in this discussion.

We notice briefly a few of the points here established beyond all reasonable doubt.

1. No Christian—["all justified persons are clearly Christians"—Castle]—walks in darkness. If we say we have fellowship with him [as surely all regenerate souls have], and walk in darkness, we lie." There is no such thing in God's family as walking in darkness.

Thus it becomes obvious that all who could say with Bishop Castle, "I was plunged into the most excessive gloom," believing that they were at the same time in the regenerate state, greatly misunderstood both their moral state and the word of God in our text; for,

2. All who have fellowship with God, "walk in the light as he is in the light." "God is light," and he "dwells in his children and walks in them," and they dwell in him. "I in you, and you in me."

3. GOD AND HIS CHILDREN HOLD SWEET FELLOWSHIP AND COMMUNION ONE WITH THE OTHER. This is the most glorious fact of which we as yet have

any knowledge or conception. "Fellowship one with another." "I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. 3: 20.)

4 As Dr. Clarke says on the text, "'The blood of Christ'—the meritorious efficacy of his passion and death—has purged our consciences from dead works, and cleanseth us, continues to cleanse us; that is, to keep clean what he has made clean, for it requires the same merit and energy to preserve holiness in the soul of man, as to produce it." All will accept these remarks.

With this view agree precisely the words of Mr. Wesley when he says, "Christ does not give life to the soul separate from but in and with himself. Hence his words are equally true of all men, in whatsoever state of grace they are, 'as the branch can not bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me; without [or separate from] me ye can do nothing.' * * * For our perfection is not like that of a tree, which flourishes by the sap derived from its own root, but as was said before, like that of a branch, which united to the vine bears fruit, but severed from it, is dried up and withered." (C. P., page 16.) Again he says, "The holiest of men still need Christ as their prophet, as the light of the world; for he does not give them light, but from moment to moment, the instant he

withdraws, all is darkness. They still need Christ as their king; for God does not give them a stock of holiness. But unless they receive a supply every moment, nothing but unholiness would remain." (C. P., page 30.)

Certainly, all the "second-work" people will receive these excellent words from their venerable father. They are surely correct.

5. Isaiah says, "Come, let us walk in the light of the Lord." (Isa. 2: 5.) God's truth is light. Paul says, "Whatsoever makes manifest is light." (Eph. 5: 13.) Again he says, "We walk by faith, not by sight." (II. Cor. 5: 7.) We walk in the light of God's truth "as seeing him who is invisible." (Heb. 11: 27.) The Thessalonians, of whom all the "second-work" authors say they were in need of the second work, because Paul prayed, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly," are by that same apostle called "the children of light." (I. Thess. 5: 5.) Jesus said, "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." (John 8: 12.) Do not all regenerate persons follow him? No one will deny that they do. Well, then, all regenerate persons "walk in the light of life." Here Jesus expresses precisely the second grand idea expressed in our text; namely, every follower of Jesus walks in the light

of God. Well, our text declares of all such that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

6. So then our text irresistibly bears us to the conclusion that all Christians,—not "hope-so" Christians, nor "have-been" Christians, but NOW Christians—are now "cleansed," and now being kept cleansed "from all sin." "Every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." "He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him."

Every Christian loves every other Christian; because they have a common parentage, a common nature, a common Savior, "have been baptized by the same Spirit into the same family, drank of the same Spirit," and have the same "love of God shed abroad in the heart by the same Spirit. They all love one another. Well, he that loveth his brother, abideth in the light," and "if he walk in the light, he has the present, perfect cleansing." "The blood CLEANSETH" at the present moment. It "cleanseth from ALL sin." That means a perfect work. It brings him to Christian perfection.

7. The intelligent reader will be interested to know how Mr. Wesley gets his doctrine over our text. Let us therefore hear the eminent father of

the double-birth doctrine on this text, which is so dreadfully against it. The divine says, "And again; 'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' Now, it is evident the apostle here speaks of a deliverance wrought in this world; for he saith not, the blood of Christ will cleanse, (at the hour of death, or in the day of judgment,) but it cleanseth at the time present, us living Christians, from all sin. And it is equally evident that if any sin remain, we are not cleansed from all sin. If any unrighteousness remain in the soul, it is not cleansed from all unrighteousness. Neither let any say that this relates to justification only, or the cleansing us from the guilt of sin; first, because this is confounding together what the apostle clearly distinguishes, who mentions, first, to forgive us our sins, and then to cleanse us from all unrightousness; secondly, because this is asserting justification by works, in the strongest sense possible. It is making all inward as well as all outward holiness necessarily previous to justification; for if the cleansing here spoken of is no other than the cleansing us from sin, then we are not cleansed from guilt; that is, not justified, unless on condition of walking in the light, as he is in the light." (C. P., page 7.)

I have given Mr. Wesley's entire argument to

avoid all unfairness, and because the first half of his remarks are excellent on present purity.

(1) The unbiased reader can not overlook the fact that Mr. Wesley here carefully ignores regeneration, and recognizes no other cleansing in connection with justification than a "cleansing from the guilt of sin." He ought to have known, as everybody else well knows, that there can be no such thing as cleansing from guilt. It is absurd to talk of such a thing. Guilt may be remitted, pardoned, forgiven, but not cleansed. Cleansing can have no other object but pollution—the corrupt nature of the soul. Guilt is the attitude of the soul with respect to law and penalty. The guilty soul lies at the feet of Justice, a prisoner in chains. Pollution is a nature of the unregenerate soul which, if not washed away,—cleansed,—would immediately plunge it into guilt as fast as sovereign mercy could speak its pardon. "A corrupt tree can not bring forth good fruit." Hence bad fruit and consequent guilt would be the inevitable product of every motion of the soul. Pardon would be of no more use to the polluted soul than laughing mockery. If Mr. Wesley had mentioned—in connection with pardon—"the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," —Titus 3: 5,—which he well knew is an invariable concomitant of justification, he would have

brought before the mind a real cleansing. But this is what he was not interested to do. This would have fully shown the lucidness of the apostle's expressions concerning two divine acts without the least need of Mr. Wesley's second moral birth to explain his meaning.

(2) John used two words, "forgive," and "cleanse," to express the two ideas attached to them respectively, simply because he could not express both ideas with one word. But this affords not a shadow of evidence that he believed the two divine acts are chronologically separated, and do not occur at the same time. He was simply obliged to mention one idea before he mentioned the other—from the consideration stated, that he could not mention both at once. Paul, in some cases, mentions the cleansing first. "And such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (I. Cor. 6: 11.) (See also Titus 3: 5, 7.)

Did Paul intend a chronological separation of the divine acts of "washing and justifying," and in the order here stated? If so, then we must regard the "second work" as consisting of justification, and that a good while after sanctification. They occur simultaneously.

(3) Mr. Wesley thinks that "if no other cleans-

ing but that of justification is intended by the apostle, then he teaches justification by works,—and that walking in the light is the works upon which the divine clemency is conditioned.

To this we may remark, that if "walking in the light" is works, then Mr. Wesley himself unequivocally teaches the doctrine of sanctification by works; for he here suspends it on the condition of "walking in the light." The argument he adduces strikes his own theory with far greater momentum than it does anything else. "They who live in glass houses should be careful about throwing stones." Mr. Wesley would have acted more judiciously by ignoring this text altogether. But his effort to harmonize it with his doctrine affords us the best evidence of their irreconcilable antagonism. Such an effort is hopeless.

John plainly teaches that pardon and "cleansing from all unrighteousness" occur at the same moment.

8. We do well to remember the following points:

(1) Our text mentions only one act of Deity; namely, "cleansing from all sin."

(2) Every soul must proceed—"walk"—in accordance with the light of divine truth in order to obtain pardon.

(3) The "walk in the light" is a walk of faith.

"We walk by faith, not by sight." Every soul starts in the march of faith before he reaches either pardon or purity. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God."

(4) Faith is not works. "By grace are ye saved through faith; * * * not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2: 8, 9.)

(5) The soul must have both pardon and purity before it can have peace; for "there is no peace, saith God, to the wicked." And every uncleansed soul would, if pardoned this moment, be wicked the next, just as sure as "a corrupt tree can not bring forth good fruit," nor a "bitter fountain send forth sweet water."

(6) Therefore John, by order of the Spirit, set forth pardon and purification as occurring at the same moment, for the benefit and comfort of both the unconverted and the sanctified. They both need it as a means of comfort; for the former are in sin, and the latter are liable to fall into sin. And when they do fall, they need, first of all things, to know just what John tells them, that, "If we confess our sins, [not throwing ourselves back on our religious dignity, but humbly at the mercy-seat confess,] he is faithful and just to forgive our sins, and [not only so, but even again,] to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," as he did at the first; for every sin makes a stain, and throws

the soul back into the unsaved state. To all such God says, "I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen; and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." (Rev. 2: 4, 5.) And those who do repent and confess will obtain mercy, pardon, and purification again as at the first. If they do the first works, they will again obtain first love and the same purification as at the first.

SCRIPTURE 9.—*I. John* 3: 7, 8.

"*He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil.*"

1. It is a very easy matter for the vilest of sinners to do many acts which, abstractly considered, are right. They are capable of doing many acts which, considered only with respect to the mechanical performance, their effects upon others, the social, political, and domestic relations of their agent, are precisely as good as if performed by the most pious and devoted saint on earth. Food, clothing, schooling, and church-privileges provided by a wicked father, are as really good for the

child as if provided by a saint. A chapter may be read and a piece of music performed as correctly by a rascal as by a *Fenelon*.

2. Thus it is plain, that if we were to interpret our text in the light of the Rev. Professor Samuel Franklin, A. M., as given in his elaborate and scholarly "Review of Wesleyan Perfection," page 241.

"CHRISTIAN PERFECTION IS AN OUTWARD WORK." (Page 229.) "It was the outward keeping of the command of God which generically and summarily was embraced in the words, 'Walk before me, and be thou perfect,'" we should find hosts of wicked men who are occasionally as completely "righteous," as thoroughly "perfect," as any saint on earth. There are very few, if any, who do not perform many acts which are externally righteous. If "he that doeth external righteousness is surely righteous," then there are many righteous wicked men; nay, there is not a constantly unrighteous man on earth.

We should do crushing violence to God's word, as given by the hand of his servant John, were we to adopt this Franklinian view of Christian perfection. We should do violence to the entire word of God.

Jesus after Isaiah said, "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me

with their lips; but their heart is far from me." (Matt. 15: 8.) God says, "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." (I. Sam. 16: 7.) "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life." (Prov. 4: 23.) "Know thou the God of thy fathers, and serve him with a PERFECT HEART." (I. Chron. 28: 9.) "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." (Rom. 2: 28, 29.)

3. Thus it is clear that HEART-RIGHTEOUSNESS is the ONLY righteousness with God. Mere mechanical actions performed by the muscles, in harmony with God's commands, amount to nothing by way of securing, at the eternal throne, a reputation for righteousness. Nothing but RIGHT HEART-ACTION can secure such a reputation before the throne. Paul says, "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, [love] it profiteth me nothing." (I. Cor. 13: 3.) It is righteous SOUL-action that John refers to in our text. "He that doeth righteousness" in the inward man, the heart, the soul, "IS RIGHTEOUS;" that is, HOLY, PURE, SANCTIFIED, PERFECT.

4. The only question now to be settled in order to settle this whole question is this: "CAN A REGENERATE SOUL WHO HAS NOT HAD A SECOND MORAL BIRTH PERFORM A RIGHTEOUS ACT IN THE DEFINED AND REFINED SENSE OF OUR TEXT?

(1) If he can, then, according to our text, he "*is righteous;*" he is pure; he is holy.

(2) If he can, if he does, then, according to "the faithful and true witness," "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," he IS PURE. This Witness says, "A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." (Matt. 7: 18.)

Here is mentioned an impossibility. The trees of different characters are used to illustrate men of different moral characters. It is taught in the illustration that an impure heart can not originate pure actions. This is the impossibility.

On the affirmative side of our exceedingly important question we may remark:

(1) If the soul in the regenerate state can not perform a righteous act in the refined sense of the text, then it surely needs a second moral birth; and the double moral birth theology stands approved as a Bible truth, and this writing is all on the wrong side of the question.

(2) But further, if he can not do a righteous act, then his regeneration is USELESS. His heav-

enly birth is a thing of no value to him, neither for purity nor for innocency; for the very first motion of the soul in thought, reasoning, motive, affection, choice, or will, must be evil, wrong, SINFUL. Every sinful act brings guilt. Pardon would be followed the next moment with guilt and condemnation.

(3) If the regenerate soul can not do a righteous act, then Mr. Wesley is surely in error when he says, "Even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin" (C. P., page 4); for if he can not do a purely righteous act, then of course his acts are all, like those of the common sinner, sinful without any exception. "Evil, only evil, and that continually." (Gen. 6: 5.) Evil without mixture of good, "*only evil*," and evil without cessation, "evil *continually*." He has gained simply nothing by his conversion if he can not do a purely righteous act.

(4) If the regenerate soul can do no "righteousness" in the sense of the text, then we are forced to the conclusion that regeneration secures no spiritual relationship to God; for John declares, in the tenth verse of the same chapter of our text, "Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God." Then he still remains a child of the devil, just as the text says, "He that committeth sin is of the devil." In the early part of this

work we saw that the double-birth doctrine makes the regenerate soul at least half a child of the devil. But now we see clearly that it places him entirely in Satan's family. There is no escaping this conclusion on the hypothesis that he is incapable of righteous action in the sense of our text; that is, in the PUREST sense. And if he IS capable of such action, then, as we have already noticed, he is righteous, according to the testimony of all Bible witnesses, as our text declares, "*He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he* [God] *is righteous.*" This places the regenerate soul in harmony with the Savior's command, "*Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.*" (Matt. 5: 48.)

SCRIPTURE 10.—*Gal.* 5: 24.

"*They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.*"

1. All agree that all converted persons belong to Christ.

2. The text clearly states that all these have, as a matter of fact, "crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." Who? "They that are Christ's." This embraces every regenerate person, without exception.

3. This crucifixion of the flesh is. according to

Mr. Wesley, as we noticed under "SCRIPTURE 4," "a deliverance from inward as well as from outward sin."

4. It is admitted on all hands that such deliverance places the soul in a state of perfect moral purity. The carnal, Adamic, fallen nature is crucified, and "subsists no more."

5. All readily agree that God and his love take up their abode in the heart at the very moment of conversion. No one denies that, as Paul declares of every justified person, "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us." (Rom. 5: 5.)

6. Admitting, then, as all must do, that the expression, "They that are Christ's," embraces all regenerate persons, that all these "have crucified the carnal nature," and so emptied their hearts of all evil, and that at that moment God filled their hearts with his presence and his love,—"for God is love,"—we are carried irresistibly to the conclusion that at that moment they are raised from the low estate of lost sinners to the exalted character of perfect Christians. They certainly have reached a state in which "pure love reigns alone in the heart and life." And this, Mr. Wesley after Jesus and Paul and the New Testament says, "is the whole of Christian perfection." "Love is the fulfilling of the law." How any un-

biased mind can contemplate our text and conclude that the carnal mind lives in the regenerate nature is beyond my comprehension. It seems impossible for an honest, careful thinker to do so. No doubt the profound Dr. Adam Clarke saw in our present text the infallible assurance of his position when he remarked on Gal. 5:16,—"Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh,"—saying, "If the Spirit of God dwell in and rule your heart, THE WHOLE CARNAL MIND WILL BE DESTROYED, and then * * the works and propensities of the flesh will be abandoned."

Let no man imagine he is a Christian who is under the dominion of fleshly lusts. If he never, with the aid of almighty Power, "crucified his flesh with the affections and lusts," he was never born into the family of God, and is none of his. If he has submitted to that indispensable crucifixion, but failed to continue in it by suffering "roots of bitterness to spring up" from seeds thrown into his heart by Satan or his servants, or worldly objects through the channel of careless thought and his physical nature, then he "has fallen from grace," "left his first love," and needs to "remember whence he is fallen, repent, and do his first works" (Rev. 2: 4, 5), or eternal ruin will be his inevitable doom.

SCRIPTURE 11.—*II. Cor.* 5: 17.

"*If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.*"

1. Every one knows that this was never intended to be understood as having reference to the physical part of our being—the outward, perishing man. Our flesh and bones are not made new by conversion.

2. Every one knows equally well that conversion does not change our intellectual constitution. As the number, character, texture, and composition of the bones, members, and muscles of our physical organism remain the same after conversion as before, so the number, nature, office, and relations of the powers of our intellectual constitution also remain the same. True, they become much quickened, elastic, and buoyant, by consequence of the circumstances of joy, peace, consistency, and honesty of action, &c.; but in other respects they remain the same.

3. As we have but three natures,—the physical, the intellectual, and the moral,—and as the renovation spoken of in our text does not relate to the first two, it must relate to the third. *There is a new creation in the moral realm at conversion.* This is admitted on all hands. The only dispute over

this text is in regard to the *extent of this new creation in the moral realm.*

I can scarcely find better words to express my view on this question than the words of the eminent father of the very doctrine I am opposing throughout this entire volume. In a sermon on this same doctrine Mr. Wesley says:

"4. We allow that the state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious. He is born again 'not of blood, nor of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' He is a child of God, a member of Christ, an heir of the kingdom of heaven. 'The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keepeth his heart and mind in Christ Jesus.' His very body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, a 'habitation of God through the Spirit.' He is created anew in Christ Jesus;' he is washed; he is sanctified. His heart is purified by faith; he is cleansed 'from the corruption that is in the world.' 'The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him.' And so long as he 'walketh in love' (which he may always do), he worships God in spirit and in truth. He keepeth the commandment of God, and doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight, so exercising himself as to 'have a conscience void of offense toward God and toward man;' and he has power both over

outward and inward sin, even from the moment he is justified."

(1) There is but one additional word that Mr. Wesley could have employed to express the moral dignity of the regenerate soul. That word is "holy." Yet he says he is "sanctified" and "purified." These two terms express all that can be expressed by the term "holy." And he says, "He keepeth the commandments of God." This puts the whole matter to rest. One of God's commands is, "*Be ye holy.*" If he keeps this command he is, of course, holy. And if he is sanctified, purified, and is holy, which he must be to "keep the commandments of God," then he is HOLY, of course; and this settles the whole question. "*He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.*" (I. John 3 : 7.)

(2) Mr. Wesley made these broad, all-sufficient concessions, *a.* because he could not do less. The exigencies of the situation demanded it. The points are undeniably set forth in the sacred Scriptures. *b.* He seems to make them in the hope that his seeming fearlessness of them will inspire his readers with the confidence that they are not antagonistic to his doctrine. The characteristics which he attributes to the regenerate soul plainly indicate that it is in the full enjoyment of what he elsewhere calls "*Christian perfection.*"

He says positively that the justified soul is "SANCTIFIED." This is the term commonly employed throughout christendom, and especially among the double-birth theologians, Mr. Wesley included (C. P., Q. 16), to designate the highest attainable moral state. Mr. Wesley felt compelled to apply it to every justified soul because it is so easy to show that Paul so applies it. (See "13 SCRIPTURE, 3–6.")

He felt compelled to say that every justified soul is "*purified in heart*" because it is so easy to show that the hearts of the congregation at the house of Cornelius were made pure in the first moment of their conversion. (See "SCRIPTURE 14.")

Moral purity is acknowledged on all hands to be the highest MORAL state attainable in this life, or any other. When the soul is pure it is of course free from all impurity. That which is pure can not be the object of a cleansing process.

He felt compelled to say of every justified person that "his very body is a temple of the Holy Ghost," because it is so easy to show that the Scriptures most clearly teach it. (See I. Cor. 3: 17; Rom. 5: 5; Acts 10: 44.) It seems a little strange that he omitted the words, "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are," seeing they stand in the same verse from which he partially quoted, and are more fully descriptive of the

moral character of the person he was pretending to describe. (See I. Cor. 3 : 17.) Did his memory suddenly fail as he approached these words so nearly? Or did he not wish us to grasp a full description of the character he pretended to describe? It certainly seems as though he thought a complete scriptural description would more than meet his purpose, and show clearly, as it certainly does, that every regenerate soul fully comes up to the measure of his definition of Christian perfection. This would bring to the notice of his most obtuse readers the fact that there could not remain in the heart of a justified man the slightest susceptibility of such a change as Mr. Wesley represents the double birth to be when he says, "The Son hath made them free who are thus 'born of God' from that great root of sin and bitterness—pride" (C. P., page 8), which, according to his view, was still remaining in the regenerate heart; or when he says with reference to the same case, "So the change wrought when the soul dies to sin is of a different kind and infinitely greater than any before." (C. P., page 23.)

But Mr. Wesley entirely overdoes his own purpose when he says "the justified man keepeth the commandments of God." Paul declares the carnal mind can not do this. (Rom. 8 : 7.) If, then, as Mr. Wesley teaches, the regenerate heart is

"full of sin, pride, self will, and hell," "full of the carnal mind," it is simply impossible to "keep the commandments of God." So then Mr. Wesley is surely mistaken in one expression or the other. But John affirms most positively that "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." Then he "keepeth the commands of God." So that Mr. Wesley is wrong when he says "the regenerate soul is full of the carnal mind."

As we have noticed, one of God's commandments is, "Be ye holy." Whoever keepeth his commands surely keeps this one. And if he keeps this command, "Be ye holy," he certainly *is holy;* for *being holy* is the only possible way of obedience in the case.

4. Thus it becomes indisputable that Mr. Wesley's testimony is abundant evidence that the soul becomes holy in the moment of regeneration. He declares,

(1) "The justified soul is a temple of God," which Paul says "is holy."

(2) "The justified soul is created anew in Christ Jesus," which "new creation" is an unlimited one in its realm, leaving not a vestige of new creation to be performed by a "second work." As our text says, "*all things are become new*" in the moral realm of the soul.

(3) "The justified soul is *washed;* he is *sancti-*

fied," which indicates the highest moral state attainable, and is all that we are contending for.

(4) "The justified man's *heart is purified*," which also indicates the highest moral state, perfectly harmonizes with John when he says, "*If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*" (I. John 1: 9), and is just what we are here contending for.

(5) "The justified soul *is cleansed from the corruption that is in the world*," which is precisely what Paul means when he says, "*He saved us by the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he shed on us abundantly" (Titus 3: 5), and is all that we are contending for, as it indicates the highest moral state attainable, even a *sinless* state.

(6) "*The justified soul*," continues Mr. Wesley, "*has the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him.*" This is precisely in harmony with Paul in his letter to the Romans (5: 5), and shows a moral state in perfect harmony with God's great fundamental commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." It shows a moral state in perfect harmony with Mr. Wesley's definition of Christian perfection. What else can

there be in the heart when it is "*washed*," "*sanctified*," "*purified*," "*cleansed from corruption*," and then filled with "*the love of God shed abroad by the Holy Ghost given unto it?*" Surely "PURE LOVE REIGNS ALONE IN" such a heart. Well, this is the "ALL THINGS NEW" of our text; and this is Mr. Wesley's Christian perfection. And as we have fully shown from his description of the regenerate soul in his sermon on "Sin in Believers," Mr Wesley is witness that such is the moral condition of every justified soul. Whatever, then, Mr. Wesley has said in support of the idea of sin in Christians, he has said in direct contradiction of his description of all justified persons, as quoted above; for with our text before him as the foundation of his most remarkable and thoroughly self-contradictory discourse, entitled, "On Sin in Believers," he, as we have just now seen, COMPLETELY SURRENDERS HIS DOCTRINE SIX TIMES BY SIX SPECIFIC AFFIRMATIONS, in one short division of his discourse. (See Wesley's Sermons, Vol. I., page 109.)

Thus it is clear, from our text, and from Mr. Wesley's constrained concessions while in the attempt to explain away its essential meaning, that THE MORAL NATURE OF THE HUMAN SOUL UNDERGOES AN ENTIRE REVOLUTION AND RENEWAL WHILE IN THE PROCESS OF REGENERATION by the almighty power

of its Holy Father. A contrary asseveration is a slander on God and his word. "*For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.*" (Gal. 6: 15.)

SCRIPTURE 12.—*Rom.* 13: 8–10.

"*He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.* * * *Love is the fulfilling of the law.*"

1. Here is a firm foundation for the definition of Christian perfection. "PURE LOVE REIGNING ALONE IN THE HEART AND LIFE."

2. God's law certainly is perfect.

3. It certainly requires perfection of all his subjects; otherwise it could not be perfect. "*Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.*" (Matt. 5: 48.)

(1) This can mean nothing beyond the moral realm of the soul.

(2) Does it mean, *Be ye imperfect* morally? It says *perfect.* I suppose God means what he says. We can not make ourselves perfect. But God can, if he is perfect; and I suppose he is. *We can submit to and trust him to make us perfect.*

4. God's law peremptorily commands, "*Be ye holy; for I am holy.*" (I. Peter 1: 16; (1) God can not associate with an unholy being. Therefore those who do not consent to nor embrace the

holy state can not be his associates—surely not his dearly-beloved children. (2) He purifies all who penitently embrace him, and makes them his fit associates, temples, children. (3) Those who do not embrace him as their holy Father, do by their rejection of Him who "stands at the door and knocks" for admittance positively and madly violate this holy command, "Be ye holy."

5. But our text declares that "love is the fulfilling of the law." Hence he who feels the "love of God shed abroad in his heart by the power of the Holy Ghost dwelling there," as he does in every regenerate heart, so that he is able sincerely to love his brother, as all Christians do, and even his enemy, as we are commanded, may rest assured that he is in perfect harmony with all God's law; not only the outward part of it, but *all*, even those commands which require holiness, purity, perfection, by their specific terms. "He that offends in one point is guilty of all" (James 2: 10), while "he that loveth another," by the aid of the Holy Ghost, is in holy harmony with all. He "hath fulfilled the law" by coming fully up to the holy state which it requires. Now it remains for him to continue his trustful hold on that mighty, holy hand which hath raised him. So doing he will be kept forever. Standing on the Rock, he can never fall. Forsaking this by trusting in some-

thing else, he finds the abyss of ruin. "*If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever.*" (I. Chron. 28: 9.)

SCRIPTURE 13.—*I. John* 2: 4, 5.

"*He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him.*"

1. How do we know that we are in him? From two facts. What are these? (1) We keep his commandments. (2) His love is perfected in us. These are the unmistakable and invariable evidences that we are in him. We love what he loves, and do his will, because his love is in our hearts.

2. Here we see that three things are inseparably connected. If (1) "we are in him," (2) we "keep his commandments." (3) "In us verily is the love of God perfected."

Whoever is in Christ, therefore, has become (morally) a new creature, by having the love of God perfected in him. Paul and John sweetly harmonize.

3. John Wesley says of every justified soul, "He keepeth the commandments of God, and

doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight; * * and he hath power both over outward and inward sin, even from the moment he is justified." This is in precise harmony with John the apostle when he says, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin. * * He can not sin, because he is born of God."

It is a matter settled, then, that, as Mr. Wesley says, "Even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin."

4. This being settled, it follows inevitably that every regenerate heart keeps all God's commandments.

5. This admitted, it follows with equal certainty that every such heart has the love of God perfected in it, and IS consequently PERFECT; for our text declares it most positively. Let men be careful how they deny what God positively affirms. GOD HAS NO UNHOLY NOR IMPERFECT CHILDREN.

SCRIPTURE 14.—*Acts* 15: 8, 9.

"*And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.*"

1. The first question here to be settled relates

to the moral or religious state of those whose hearts were purified by the Holy Ghost in response to their faith in the atoning merits of Christ, before the time here referred to.

2. Certain it is that they were gentiles. Yet their religious views were almost or quite all taken from Judaism. Cornelius prayed sincerely to God, having renounced his paganism. He worshiped God according to the best light he had. But he had not embraced Christianity. (1) The gospel had not yet been preached to the gentiles as such; for, as Dr. Clarke says, "hitherto the apostles confined their labors among the Jews and circumcised proselytes, not making any offer of salvation to the gentiles; for they had fully imbibed the opinion that none could enter into the kingdom of God and be finally saved unless they were circumcised and became obedient to the law of Moses."

(2) He was in "good report among all the nation of the Jews." (Acts 10: 22.) Hence we know he was not a Christian; for Christians were in bad report among them, and their Master was regarded by them as a vile impostor.

(3) "The apostles and brethren that were in Judea * * contended with Peter for having gone in to men uncircumcised, and eating with them" (Acts 11: 1-3), after they heard of his preaching at Cornelius' house, at which time the events re-

ferred to in our text occurred. (See Acts 10: 43, 44.)

(4) All Christians are saved; but an angel directed Cornelius to "send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house *shall be saved.*" (Acts 11: 13, 14.)

(5) Thus it is certain that they were strangers to the salvation that is in Jesus, and had no fellowship with Christians.

3. This great salvation came to their hearts in all the fullness of its PURIFYING, SANCTIFYING, and RENEWING power in the first moment of their reception of the doctrine of salvation by faith in Jesus. They had heard of Jesus, but were undecided both as to his divinity and their privileges in him, even if divine, because they were gentiles, who, as such, were rejected by both Jews and Christians. But now, since the vision of an angel by Cornelius, and the vision on the house-top by Peter, and the discovery that God was in the whole matter, opening the gospel door to the gentiles, Peter is prepared to preach to them without hesitancy the same doctrine of salvation by faith alone in Jesus, which he had embraced. And the congregation in the house of Cornelius were in like manner prepared to receive every word that fell from his lips with as much interest and

confidence as if he had been an angel directly from heaven. He commenced in good earnest: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. * * To him [Jesus] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." (Acts 10 : 34, 35, 43, 44.)

This is the event concerning which Peter uttered the words of our text, when in council with his brethren, about five years later.

4. It is perfectly obvious that, in complete harmony with Paul's declaration, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit" (I. Cor. 12: 13), they were baptized by the Holy Ghost into the family of God, the kingdom of Christ, MADE PURE FROM ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS (see our text), and received water baptism afterward as a visible emblem and profession of faith in the triune God and the invisible SPIRIT-WASHING which he had accomplished by his almighty power. This is God's regular order. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy HE SAVED us, by the WASHING of REGEN-

ERATION, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that BEING JUSTIFIED by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." (Titus 3: 5–7.)

5. Thus we clearly see why Mr. Wesley felt compelled to attribute purity to the justified soul, and made a statement which is utterly irreconcilable with his doctrine, when he said, "His heart is purified by faith; he is cleansed from the corruption that is in the world." He well knew that the prestige of ecclesiastical position was mightier to convince than reason or argument with the many, who at that day allowed the few to do their thinking for them. Happily that state of things is now fast passing away. Mr. Wesley's course in regard to the sentiment of our text is as if he should say, "Yes, purity IS purity; but yet it is not PURITY." A professed philosopher could with as much propriety say to his pupils, "The light of the sun is pure LIGHT; but still it is not PURE light; for you must remember that I, as your learned preceptor, positively declare, upon the authority and wisdom in me vested, that there is innate dismal darkness intrinsically incorporated with every ray that streams from the burning furnaces of our resplendent luminary." The gaping, credulous urchins would receive the scholas-

tic statement as the ebullition of vast learning and research in the paradoxes of nature and science, commit the words to memory, if they could, and go out, parrot-like, to show their learning among their inferiors.

In one short division of his sermon Mr. Wesley tells us that the regenerate "heart *is purified by faith;* he is *cleansed from corruption; the love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him.*" And in the very next division, on the same page, he says of the same character, "But was he not then freed from all sin, so that there is no sin in his heart? I can not say this; I can not believe it, because St. Paul says the contrary. He is speaking to believers, and describing the state of believers in general when he says, 'The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other.'" (Gal. 5: 17.) If Mr. Wesley had quoted to the end of the sentence he would have had too strong a case to suit his purpose. He would have had a picture that does not correspond with the Christian character. Let us read for ourselves: "So that ye can not do the things that ye would." They were slaves to sin. If Mr. Wesley had carefully read the entire epistle he would have learned that many of those Galatians were "*foolish*," "*bewitched*," and "*fallen*

from grace." (See 5: 4.) (See examination of this text under "14 SCRIPTURE," in "OBJECTION 24.")

Dr. Clarke could easily find evidences in the epistle of the backslidden condition of many of them. But he was not struggling to support an unscriptural doctrine. On 5: 4—"Ye are fallen from grace"—he says, "They had, therefore, in every sense of the word, fallen from grace; and whether some of them ever rose again is more than we can tell."

6. I think it is safe to conclude that Peter, the apostle to whom God intrusted the duty of preaching the first gospel sermon to the gentiles, understood the case he was speaking of, and that he meant what he said, when he uttered the words of our text in a theological discussion. He says their hearts were "*purified.*" This ought to settle the question forever.

SCRIPTURE 15.—*I. John* 2: 10.

"*He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him.*"

1. "Carnality," "hidden abominations, the depth of pride, self-will, and hell," which the double-birth doctrine affirms is in the regenerate soul, certainly would be an "occasion of stumbling." It would certainly cause stumbling.

2. But our text says "there is none occasion of stumbling in him who abideth in the light." And who is this? It is

3. "He that loveth his brother [that] abideth in the light." And who is it that loves his brother?

4. "Every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him." (I. John 5: 1.)

5. Surely, that is every regenerate soul. Every child of God loves his divine Father. And every one that loves God loves also every one that is begotten of God. That is his brother.

6. Thus it is obvious that every regenerate soul loves every other, walks in the light, and has "no occasion of stumbling in him." Therefore he has no sin in him. There is nothing in him that tends ruinward. Notice carefully, "*he abides in the light;*" and the same author says, chapter 1: 7, "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son *cleanseth us from all sin.*" This makes the case very clear. All Christians love one another, walk and abide in the light, are cleansed from all sin,—"*all unrighteousness*" (ninth verse)—and consequently have "in them *none occasion of stumbling.*" The world and Satan may deceive, however, and so lead them into captivity.

Satan can only lead the soul away by deception of some kind and degree. And he often does it. But not by means of sin in them already; for then he would be more interested to let them alone and keep them quiet and unalarmed. So multitudes are slumbering quietly in "FORMS of godliness," but destitute of the godliness and the power, and in many instances denying its existence.

SCRIPTURE 16.—*I. Cor.* 3: 16, 17.

"*Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.*"

Here it is clearly taught, that

1. God dwells in the hearts of his children as a king dwells in his temple. "The kingdom of God is within you." "Christ liveth in me." "Abide in me and I in you." "I will dwell in them and walk in them."

2. That "the temple of God is holy;" that is to say, he dwells not in a polluted, defiled temple.

3. That those Corinthians were many of them—probably a large majority, with but a few exceptional cases,—holy. "*The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.*" This is precisely equivalent to saying, "*Ye are holy.*" Yet our double-birth

theologians all agree in saying the Corinthians had never obtained the "second change"—the "instantaneous deliverance after justification." (Wesley and Wood.)

Paul declares they were "*holy, washed, sanctified.*" (See text, and 6: 11.)

I suppose his testimony in the case is good and reliable. He doubtless understood what he was saying fully as well as the divines who set aside his positive declarations to get rid of his testimony against a doctrine for which they have not a syllable of direct support. They never claim any of this kind. All they claim on their main point is simply second-rate indirect inference. Every man in christendom has the means of knowing that the second-work doctrine has not a syllable of direct support in God's word. It has not a syllable of support there, either direct or indirect. But what we should remember is this, that none of the passages claimed as evidence, are claimed to teach it DIRECTLY. All that they claim for their doctrine in the Scriptures is that certain passages seem to assume it as if it were clearly taught by some other passage in some other place. But that other passage in that other place, clearly and directly teaching it, we never can induce them to bring forward. It is always like the lawyer's absent witness. He was dead, and therefore absent.

SCRIPTURE 17.—*Luke* 14: 26, 33.

"*If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he can not be my disciple.* * * * *Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he can not be my disciple.*"

The second statement is simply a restatement of the idea to be conveyed.

To "*hate*" here means to regard with much less esteem.

CONSECRATION is the matter under consideration.

1. We all agree that every justified soul is a disciple of Christ.

2. We all agree that entire consecration must precede sanctification or holiness, as a condition of its attainment.

3. We all agree that entire consecration will surely bring full salvation or holiness. Consecration is not holiness; but it is the act of the creature on account of which or "because" of which God accepts the soul into his favor, and imparts to it his full salvation. [The word "full" is here added in accommodation to my opponents. I know of no partial, moral salvation.] Consecration is the act of "TRUST." It involves the two mental acts or states—confidence

and submission. These two acts constitute trust or consecration. "Our heart shall rejoice in him, *because* we have *trusted* in his holy name." (Psalms 33 : 22.) "He shall deliver them from the wicked, and save them, *because they trust in him.*" (Psalms 37 : 40.) "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee : *because he trusteth in thee.*" (Isa. 26 : 3.) *Trust* is the "*because*" of salvation in every instance. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. * * Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. * * Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." (Rom. 4 : 3, 9; 23–25.)

"Faith without works is dead. Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" (James 2 : 20–22.) It was all an intellectual and heart-work. James does not refer to mechanical action, but to trustful action of the will, the soul. Every one knows that Abraham did not, as a matter of fact, mechanically offer his son Isaac as a slain, burnt-sacrifice. He resolved to do it. And his resolution

was just as any resolution is, so firm or decided, that he mechanically took all the preparatory steps to actually make the offering. The whole mental and moral processes of the mind and heart were the same as if he had offered his dear son. This *soul-action* is what James calls "*works.*"

Consecration is this unreserved, confiding soul-action, placing itself and all its possessions, hopes and prospects, at the feet of Jesus, there to await his sovereign will and pleasure. Such is the teaching of Jesus, the blessed and lovely One, in our text. The soul commands the body, and therefore our mechanical action will harmonize with the purposes of the soul to the extent of our powers. Hence we are generally safe in judging of a tree by its fruits; but the fruit is not the tree. Men have no other way of judging; but "God looketh at the heart." Abraham's *heart-action* was right; therefore God accepted it. When the heart-action is right, the mechanical action will harmonize to the extent of ability; and this is acceptable with God, if the ability be no more than the widow's mite. But there may be very fine mechanical action to the extent of millions of gold, or pompous religious forms and ceremonies, while all is abominated before God, because the heart does not harmonize. Hence there may be cases in which, for a time at least, man may misjudge the

tree by its fruits. When the action is right within it will be right outside, and right with God. Now we are prepared to consider, that

4. Our text differs diametrically with all who say that the soul never makes an entire consecration till after conversion.

In answering the question, "Can a soul obtain the pardon of its sins without a full and complete surrender to God?" Bishop Castle said, "If by the word 'surrender' is meant consecration to God, then I answer, Yes; for consecration proper belongs to a later and more enlightened stage of grace." (Ans. 1.)

Bishop Castle is a very fine representative of the class of theologians here controverted; and he has here very definitely represented their position on consecration. As we have seen in a chapter on "contradictions," they frequently contradict one another and themselves; yet the bishop here gives us a definite expression of the general tenor of their teaching. They almost universally leave the impression that the sinner may obtain pardon on condition of a reserved, a limited consecration. They all talk about having enjoyed the graces of justification and regeneration for a length of time without having all on the altar of consecration, and then obtaining (as some have worded it) "the blessing of sanctification by placing ALL on the al-

tar"—(H) by "trusting ALL in the hands of the Lord"—A. Wood—"then I believed fully"—D—"by giving up my cattle, my horses, my sheep, my farm and ALL."—P.

(1) To all these Jesus says, "Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he can not be my disciple." There is no disciple of Christ who has not committed all into his hands. This may be done without contemplating all the items separately and distinctly. But no man ever obtained pardon while in the mental attitude of holding something in reserve from God as sovereign proprietor and disposer of ALL. The reserve of one solitary smallest item will bar the soul from the kingdom of God. He is the only Sovereign in existence. Man is a pensioner on his bounty. A solitary reserve is assuming the attitude of independence and self-control. It is setting up the whole, indivisible will of a pigmy creature against the whole, indivisible will of his independent, most lovely sovereign Lord. It is assuming superiority to God. It is equivalent to saying, either, "I know best what to do with the item,—that is, what ought to be done with it,"—or, "I am able to make and carry out my own arrangement, whether it suits God or not." Either of these attitudes of soul is a false one. They are rebellion. God can not extend amnesty to a soul in the atti-

tude of rebellion. Surrender must precede pardon—COMPLETE, UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER.

(2) When the soul makes no reserve of an item in its surrender to God, then it is in the attitude of complete consecration, whether it at the moment contemplates all the items which are comprised in the whole or not. To say that it must first contemplate every item before the consecration can be complete, is to set up a rule which would keep the soul in perpetual doubt in many if not all cases. There would be a perplexity and doubt as to whether the last item had been considered. The itemizing process is a very healthy and commendable one. But if the soul were burdened with a rule requiring a perfectly itemized consecration prior to sanctification, it would be kept in the fear that something had been overlooked. But it requires very little intellectual exertion to say, "Here, Lord, I give myself away, to be forever thine, with ALL I AM, with ALL I claim, with ALL that I can do for thee, and with all I hope to be or claim or do. All is thine for evermore." When the HEART says this, God will instantaneously fill it with his presence and love and holiness. "Every one that asketh receiveth." (Matt. 7: 8.) Whenever the soul reaches after God he comes.

5. With our text before him, let no man call

himself a disciple unless his soul IS NOW in the attitude of unreserved consecration to God. The least reserve makes present condemnation certain, whether it be felt or not. God does not at every moment smite the guilty soul with a FEELING of REMORSE. Now is not the TIME, and this world is not the PLACE for the PUNISHMENT of the guilty. Yet the soul that is not in the attitude of unreserved consecration can not have the conscious witnessings and fruits of the Spirit in his heart. He is not a disciple of Jesus. Our text condemns him, however much he may deceive himself with his own flatteries, saying, "Peace, peace." "*There is no peace, saith my God to the wicked.*" All disobedience is wickedness. God commands full, unreserved consecration. The attitude of reserve for wealth, or honor, or pleasure, is rebellion. "*He that forsaketh not all that he hath, can not be my disciple.*" "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or *whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.*" (I. Cor. 10: 31.) This is the sacred comment on our text. Take God in as a partner of your firm,—a ruling partner,—to be honored in everything. God made this universe to be honored by it. And it will be so. Those who will not honor him with their love and praise, will honor him with their wailings over the lost privilege of enjoying his love and association. He never will honor a soul

with either till it first honors him with the consecration of its entire being and interests, to be forever tributary to his glory. Then will he honor it as a beggar would be honored by a home in a king's palace.

SCRIPTURE 18.—*Eph.* 1: 7.

"*In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.*"

1. The abstract idea of forgiveness does not comprise all of redemption, though it is a part of redemption. We can cogitate a complete idea of forgiveness apart from the whole of redemption.

2. Redemption in its most extensive sense includes the resurrection of the body and its reunion with the soul in all the vigor, symmetry, beauty, and loveliness of primeval man immortalized. "Waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body." (Rom. 8: 23.)

3. Moral redemption, as enjoyed in this life, includes pardon and purity. No one enjoys moral redemption until he is holy.

(1) In that sublime piece of composition, the thirty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, we find a fine description of the redeemed soul. He says:

"A highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those:

the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there." (Isa. 35: 8, 9.)

a. No lion-like character shall be there. No ravenous, beastly man shall go up thereon.

b. "The unclean shall not pass over it." None but the holy, the pure, ever travel that road, the highway of the redeemed, the only way to heaven.

Well, who travels on it?

c. "*The redeemed shall walk there.*"

d. "The redeemed, but not the unclean." This is clear. The second-work theologians all tell us that every regenerate soul is on his way to heaven. Are there two ways, one for the pure and another for the half-pure? If any one knows that there are two ways, an upper and a lower, pray tell us how he found them out. Where is the chart? How, or of whom can we learn it? Truly, Jesus tells us of two ways, a broad one and a narrow one. But they do not both lead to the same place. One leads to destruction. That is not heaven, surely. Where is the evidence of the existence of two ways leading to heaven? There is none. No man ever started for heaven till his heart was made pure. "*The unclean shall not pass over it. But the redeemed shall walk there.*"

e. The doctrine that lions, tigers, ravenous beasts and unclean beasts are on the way toward heaven and eternal glory, is doubtless sending more souls to ruin than a large majority of all the other causes. Satan can ruin souls ONLY BY DECEPTION; NEVER BY MECHANICAL FORCE. HENCE HE IS MORE INTERESTED IN ERRONEOUS DOCTRINES PROCLAIMED FROM THE PULPIT AND THE CATECHISM THAN IN ALL OTHER MEANS OF DESTRUCTION.

4. Our text clearly shows that forgiveness of sins and redemption always go hand in hand. As we have before noticed, forgiveness without purity would be utterly useless to the soul, in view of the fact that a corrupt heart can no more retain its innocence for a solitary moment than a corrupt tree can bring forth good fruit, or a bitter fountain send forth sweet waters, or a thistle bear figs, or a thorn grapes. Paul, like all the other inspired writers, fully recognized this fact announced by the Redeemer and by the Holy Ghost. Indeed, so fixed and thoroughly understood is this fact with the sacred writers that they often use the terms "forgiveness" and "justification," as if they were synonyms of "redemption." Our text is an instance of this kind. In his letter to the Colossians, the apostle uses this expression, "In whom we have *redemption*, * * * *even* the *forgiveness* of sins." (Col. 1: 14.) This looks much as

if Paul regarded the two words—"*redemption*" and "*forgiveness*"—as if they were synonyms; yet every one knows they are not. Neither are the words "*justification*" and "*regeneration*" synonyms; yet the double-birth writers are disgracefully careless in their interchangeable use of them, as if they were synonyms of each other. Their conduct in this particular has wofully befogged their readers. There is precisely the same propriety in using "*justification*" as a synonym of "*sanctification*," "*purification*," "*baptism of the Holy Ghost*," and "*redemption*," as there is in using it as a synonym of *regeneration;* for the acts are all done by the same divine agent AT THE SAME MOMENT.

SCRIPTURE 19.—*I. Cor.* 13 : 1–3, 13.

"*Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.* * * *And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.*"

1. The Greek word agape, which is here rendered *charity*, bears precisely the same meaning as the English word *love*.

2. Love is here spoken of as the greatest of all

graces. If we could have all other graces, they would amount to nothing without this one.

(1) "*The end of the commandment is charity;*" *that is, love.* (I. Tim. 1: 5.)

(2) "*He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.*" (Rom. 13: 8)

(3) "*Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.*" (Rom. 13: 10.)

(4.) "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. *On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*" (Matt. 22: 37–40.

(5) "Above all these things put on charity [*love*], *which is the bond of perfectness.*" (Col. 3: 14.)

(6) From the chapter of our text,—which is probably the most important chapter in the New Testament,—and from the two verses next preceding our last quotation, we learn that charity or love is the most important of all the graces; that indeed it is superior to them all, and to all other endowments bestowed by the Holy Spirit, and for the following reasons:

[1] No other grace imaginable without LOVE can ever fit the soul for association with God and the holy angels. But LOVE fits it for the highest

society in the universe of God. It fits it for fellowship with God himself. Indeed, the soul is never filled with love till it is filled with the divine presence dwelling in the very center and essence and nature of its being and substance in the most intimate association imaginable. "*Abide in me and I in you.*" "*I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me.*" (Jesus.)

[2.] No other grace but love excludes from the heart that undue amount of self-interest which would produce disorder by arraying the soul's powers in some sense and in some degree against the interests, and so against the happiness of others. But "*love worketh no ill to his neighbor;*" hence it brings the soul into harmony with the great end sought to be secured by the great, good heart of God in the enactment of law.

[3] No gift, grace, or endowment but love can ever be a sufficient warranty of eternal order. LOVE IS THE ONLY WARRANTY OF ORDER ON EARTH OR IN HEAVEN. It worketh no ill. It will never disturb the peace or the interests of others. Hence it is the only passport to the kingdom of eternal peace.

[4] When the graces of patience, forbearance, meekness, mercy, shall be unnecessary, because trials, temptations, and provocations will be no more; when prophecies are no more needed; when

scientific knowledge and the arts are no more needed; when the knowledge or the miraculous gift of tongues shall be useless, LOVE will still be as necessary as an element of bliss and a warranty of order as it ever was on earth. No rolling cycles of ages will ever usher in a period when it will not be an absolute necessity in each inhabitant of heaven as a warranty of order and a qualification for bliss as is the existence and moral beauty of God.

[5] Faith and hope will forever have a place to fill in the bosom of the redeemed; for the soul will ever look on God and on the perpetual future with faith and hope. Yet these, in the bosom of each, relate to his own composure and comfort more than to others; while LOVE in each one makes him a reliable member of society, a trustworthy associate, an object of sweet affection, and a means of social bliss to every other member in the community on earth or in heaven. Therefore love is superior to faith and hope

[6] Faith is the means or condition of salvation. LOVE IS THE STATE OF SALVATION—SALVATION ITSELF. Faith takes hold on God. Love is the LIKENESS of God, the IMAGE OF GOD, the MORAL BEAUTY of God.

"LOVE sits in his eyelids,
And scatters delight
Through all the bright mansions on high;
Their faces, the cherubim, vail in his sight,
And tremble with fullness of joy."

"GOD IS LOVE."

[7] All the external acts of beneficence that any one can perform, even to the extent of ALL his possessions and HIS LIFE at the stake, amount to nothing in the way of salvation or of moral excellency, if the heart be not filled with love. Love will invariably produce good fruits; but good fruits will never produce love in the heart of the performer.

[8] "*Love is the bond of perfectness.*" Love is moral perfection, because it is the bond of union, order, harmony, and bliss in perfect society. Heaven has none but perfect society. Love is the bond which holds together in blissful order and harmony all the redeemed and the angelic hosts, in one sweet, grand, glorious bundle of perfectness, and holds it in union and harmony with God, the glorious center around whom all the shining multitude in blissful harmony spontaneously crystallize. Love is the everlasting golden chain of gravitation which sweetly, firmly binds the shining orbs of God's moral universe to their ineffable Center. "Pure love reigning alone in the heart, is the whole of Christian perfection." (Wesley.)

3. Without this pure love reigning alone in our hearts, we are absolutely nothing in point of salvation or moral excellency. Such is the indisputable teaching of our text. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, * * and have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, * * and have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not *love*, I am *nothing*." [Absolutely *nothing* in religion.] "And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not *love*, it profiteth me *nothing*."

SCRIPTURE 20.—*Matt.* 7: 18.

"*Neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.*"

1. Mr. Wesley, speaking of the "merely justified" soul, says, "He keepeth the commandments of God, and doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight, so exercising himself as to have a conscience void of offense toward God and toward man; and he has power both over outward and inward sin, even from the moment he is justified." (Sermons, Vol. I., page 109.)

2. Here is a plain case of a tree bringing forth good fruit. It is certainly good fruit to keep God's commands, and do the things that please him, and keeping a good conscience toward God

and man. There is not a Christian nor Bible-student in christendom that would call such conduct bad fruit. They would all with one voice pronounce it good, thoroughly good, only good.

3. Now, one of two things is certain: Either Jesus was mistaken when he uttered our text, or Mr. Wesley was mistaken when he said, "If there be no such second work, if there be no instantaneous deliverance after justification, we must remain full of sin till death;" and all are mistaken when they say the heart of the regenerate soul is the abode of moral corruption. Who is correct? Jesus or these second-work theologians? Sure as Jesus is "the faithful and true witness, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," so sure the double-birth doctrine is based on a myth; for it has no foundation in God's word, and is utterly inconsistent with the

TWENTY SCRIPTURES WHICH WE HAVE NOW SEEN ARE DIRECTLY AGAINST IT.

"A corrupt tree can not bring forth good fruit." The regenerate soul brings forth good fruit. Therefore it is not corrupt. If he is not corrupt, he is pure. "He keepeth God's commands, and doeth the things that please him," says Mr. Wesley. And John says, "He can not sin, because he is born of God." A bad heart certainly can sin, without

any change of moral nature; but a regenerate soul can not sin without a change of moral nature. He is pure. But let him watch and pray, or he will fall.

OBJECTION 26.

ITS VOTARIES HURTFULLY IGNORE THE SOUL'S LIABILITY TO BACKSLIDE, AND THE NATURE AND IMPERCEPTIBILITY OF THE BACKSLIDING PROCESS.

1. All Calvinists believe that "Christians do not fall away from grace." (See Dr. Barnes on Matt. 7: 23.)

2. A kind of charitable compromise with Calvinist Christians, mixed with a culpable inattention to the Scriptures on the point, together with some other influences, has led many Arminians into the mistaken notion that backsliding is an exceedingly rare thing.

3. It is always mortifying to acknowledge that we have done wrong, and are therefore guilty. The hardest thing for the soul to do is to plead guilty without an excuse. Backsliding is always a concomitant of guilt. Therefore it is very hard to acknowledge a backslidden state.

4. In consequence of these facts it is a delicate matter for a pastor to accuse any of his flock of being in a backslidden state. (1) It is equiva-

lent to an accusation of rebellion against God. (2) It is easier to throw the blame on the devil, or on human depravity, or on the defectiveness of regeneration; that is, the imperfection of the plan and work of redemption. (3) It is easiest of all to attribute moral deflections to the assumed fact that there are two grades of children in God's family,—the perfect and the imperfect, the whole and the sickly, the symmetrical and the decrepit, deformed and monstrous, the pure and the polluted, the good and the bad, the holy and the sinful, those in whom God reigns alone and those in whom God and Satan hold the kingdom in PARTNERSHIP. (4) It seems to be much more acceptable with the backslidden heart to tell him he is all right as far as he has gone, but that he has not yet gone up to the extent of his privilege, than it is to tell him he is backslidden and needs to "*repent and do the first works.*" He would rather be told that his "roll" is not lost, only it is an insufficient one, and must be superseded by a much larger and far more authoritative document, which he may find by traveling right on in his present course, without turning to the spot where he may imagine he lost his first one. He does not like to be sent back.

(5) Cowardly and deluded preachers, in consequence of these facts, tell the backslidden, sleepy

souls, "Your roll is not lost; it is all safe among your papers. It will answer your purpose for traveling very well. You will need a finer document before you enter the pearly gate; but you will get that somehow just at the right time. Give yourself no uneasiness about the matter. Only go on, and walk as near the middle of the road as you can—poor, depraved, polluted creatures that we all are. God does not expect us to walk straight. God alone is perfect. When he says, 'Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,' he is considerably sincere in what he says. But he very well knows there is no manner of use in expecting such a thing of creatures so fallen as we are. He only expects us to try our very best most of the time, all of the time,—all the time, indeed,—except when we forget by reason of the intensity of our affection and attention on our wordly affairs, which are so very important that we must attend to them faithfully, and therefore can not actually 'pray without ceasing.' He only expects us to pray habitually, and refrain from being habitual sinners. But we are all sinners all the time, only we must not be habitual sinners. There is a vast difference, you see, between a reluctant sinner and a habitual sinner, even though the reluctant sinner, like the other man, sins all the time."

(6) "Then, you see, if one should profess to be free from sin and have a pure heart, and then afterward fall into temptation and sin, why then it would show that he was not one of the elect—for the elect never 'fall away from grace;' and thus his case would stand against the old, cherished doctrine of our church and of our venerable sainted fathers; and this would be too bad for a moment's toleration. They could not be mistaken—great, wise, learned men as they were, pure-hearted and holy. How dare we set our opinions against theirs?" So say the followers of one class of the sainted fathers, while another class have also their parasites, who follow their leaders and supporters a long way in the path just now marked out. They say we can be Christians on the way to heaven with hearts full of "the hidden abominations, the depths of pride, self-will, and hell, yet having the witness, 'Thou art a child of God.'" "Full of sin till death." "Then God will cut short the usual work of many years in a moment." Then he will, according to these, give the soul an unconditional cleansing, and take it home to glory.

The idea of accounting for moral deflections on the ground of backslidings seems not to enter their mind. As we have repeatedly noticed in the preceding pages, Wesley, Upham, Wood,

Castle, and others talk of Christians being "sinful in thought, word, and deed," indulging "pride, lasciviousness, bombast, envy, strife," "being "full of sin till death," "seeing in themselves the hidden abominations, pride, self-will, and hell," "plunged into the most excessive gloom," "the motions of sin in the heart," "crucified sin in them struggling to break from the cross," "the form of that old life incumbering and enslaving" the regenerate soul, as if these deflections were not the fruits of backslidden hearts, but simply the fruits and evidences of a half salvation. They would have us tell the church-sinner he is all right as far as he has gone,—on his way to heaven, only keep on,—instead of telling him he is backslidden.

These facts make it necessary to say a few words on the subject of

BACKSLIDING.

I. The possibility of backsliding.

1. Facts. This whole question may be easily and quickly settled by a candid view of FACTS. FACTS supersede all necessity of lengthy reasoning on possibilities and probabilities. FACTS are stubborn things; and in this case we have abundant testimony of this most stubborn kind.

(1) Fallen angels.

"*And he* [Jesus] *said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.*" (Luke 10: 18.)

(1) Here we learn from the immortal Teacher that Satan, the old "Diabolos," the "prince of darkness," was once a shining inhabitant of heaven. There he may have abode in blissful splendor and holy innocence for many long and joyful ages, basking in the sunlight of the Holy One's ineffable countenance, drinking of the rivers of his pleasures, and singing sweetest songs of praise.

(2) But by some mistake, or abuse of freedom, he blundered, fell, and was cast out of the glorious home of God and his pure and peaceful children.

(3) He went out like lightning,—visibly, suddenly, involuntarily, irresistibly, IRRETRIEVABLY.

(4) He fell from a very high position.

"*And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.*" (Jude 6.)

"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, *prepared for the devil* [not for man] *and his angels.*" Matt. 25: 41.)

Thus it is clear,

(1) That there are *many* fallen angels or devils. There is "*Beelzebub, the prince of the devils;*" and

there are many others of the same origin, character, and condition, though less powerful and intelligent.

(2) They "*left their own estate and habitation*," intruding on forbidden realms in discontent or curiosity.

(3) They, with us, will appear at the "*judgment of the great day*."

(4) All the ends they will subserve in the divine government by their appearance in the countless throng on that solemn occasion can only be a matter of conjecture and metaphysical speculation with us. They will doubtless serve as an example and warning to the redeemed, so that none of these will ever feel tempted to leave their estate and habitation on conjectural exploration expeditions without full permission, ample instructions, and specific directions before they sail on voyages of discovery or project from the blissful mansions assigned them.

(2) FALLEN MEN—ADAM.

(1) If *angels fell* from their high and holy moral position and inheritance, surely an inferior order of beings like *men* may fall. When we examine the Bible testimony on this point we find ample evidence in the form of stubborn fact to support the proposition that many men have fallen from grace.

"*By one man* [Adam] *sin entered into the world, and death by sin.*" (Rom. 5: 12.)

"*So he drove out the man.*" (Gen. 3: 24.)

Thus we see that,

(1) As pure a man as ever lived on the planet did sin. Adam surely was pure when he came from the hand of his Creator. It is often said of backsliders, "They never were converted. If they had been born of God they would not have fallen." The impure surely can not fall from purity any more than he can fall from a tree-top who never was on one. But Adam was once pure and holy. Yet we have no evidence that he is saved. Certain it is that he sinned.

(2) It is also certain that he was driven from a position that he once occupied, a garden he once inhabited, the divine approbation which once smiled upon him, and bliss which he once enjoyed."

(3) It is equally certain that the earth was cursed with multitudes of unpleasant things in consequence of Adam's sin. A fallen, depraved progeny are inhabiting a world infested with thistles, thorns, reptiles, poisonous serpents, stinging insects, ravenous beasts, malarial swamps, desiccating winds, choking simooms, desolating tornadoes and cyclones, pestilence walking in darkness, and famine wasting at noonday.

ALL THESE ARE CONSEQUENT UPON THE BACKSLIDING FALL OF A ONCE HOLY MAN.

SAUL.

"*And it was so, that, when he had turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart; * * and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he prophesied among them.*" (I. Sam. 10: 9, 10.)

"*Saul took a sword, and fell upon it. And when his armor-bearer saw that Saul was dead, he fell likewise upon his sword, and died with him.*" (I. Sam. 31: 4, 5.)

(1) "*God gave Saul another heart.*" He always gives GOOD, PURE hearts.

(2) He even endowed him with the power of prophecy. He was with him, and greatly favored him.

(3) Saul at last committed suicide and went to ruin, after a career of great wickedness.

SOLOMON.

(1) Solomon was once the wisest man that ever lived. God gave him a special blessing of wisdom in answer to prayer. He was the author of some of the finest inspired composition in the Bible. He was a holy man.

(2) But such was his conduct at last that God said, "I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, * * because that they have *forsaken me*,

and have *worshiped Ashtoreth* the *goddess* of the Zidonians, *Chemosh* the *god* of the Moabites, and *Milcom* the *god* of the children of Ammon, and have *not walked in my ways*, to do that which is right in mine eyes, and to keep my statutes and my judgments, as did David his Father. * * Solomon sought therefore to kill Jeroboam. And Jeroboam arose, and fled into Egypt, * * until the death of Solomon." (I. Kings 11: 31, 33, 40.)

(3) "There seems every evidence that he died in his sins. His crimes were greatly aggravated. He forsook the Lord, who had appeared unto him twice. His wives turned away his heart in his old age. There is not a single testimony in the Old or New Testament that intimates he died in a safe state. That awful denunciation of divine justice stands point-blank in the way of all contrary supposition, '*If thou forsake the Lord, he will cast thee off forever.*' (I. Chron. 28: 9.) He did forsake the Lord; and he forsook him in his very last days; and there is no evidence that he ever again clave to him." (Clarke.)

PETER.

1. On the night of the betrayal, during the feast of the passover, Jesus said to his disciples, after Judas Iscariot had gone out, "*Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.*"

(John 15: 3.) This included Peter, of course Then Peter was in possession of a pure heart.

2. Yet this same Peter falsely denied his blessed Lord three times, and swore he knew him not —all before three o'clock that same night. He soon repented, with bitter tears and a broken heart. The merciful Redeemer restored to him the joys of his salvation, made him useful in the world, suffered him to die on a cross for his religion, and took him home to glory.

THE CHURCH OF EPHESUS.

"Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write; These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks; I know thy works, and thy labor, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: and hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast labored, and hast not fainted. *Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works;* or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent. But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds

of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate." (Rev. 2 : 1–6.)

1. Here is a church who were once pure at heart, with God's love reigning in it. Now the life is gone. The holy, spiritual, saving life or love which was imparted at regeneration is lost.

2. They are backslidden, but unaware of it. They have

(1) A plenty of religious profession.

(2) They have their angel, messenger, or pastor; that is, their bishop, who was probably TIMOTHY.

(3) They have a plenty of religious FORMS—"forms of godliness, but [destitute of] the power."

(4) They were very ZEALOUS. They had plenty of external "*works*" and "*labor.*"

(5) They labored with "*patience.*" It was not the patience which grows from love, but such as actuates the soul filled with worldly ambition; that is, a determination to succeed in the projected enterprise; such as actuated the Spartans, Napoleon, William Tell, Fernando Cortes, &c.

(6) They had a zeal for sound doctrine, which led them to test and expose impostors, and to hate the teachings of those who claimed to be apostles and were bogus, impostors, and of the Nicolaitans. They were inflamed with a doctrinal and sectarian zeal, like that of Saul of Tarsus when

on his way to Damascus to destroy Christians. He had much correct doctrine; but his zeal was not such as the Holy Ghost inspires. So with these Ephesians. They had zeal, but not LOVE.

(7) They actually hated the abominable PRACTICES of these Nicolaitans. The light of the gospel had not only shown them the wickedness of these practices, but also their destructive tendencies in community and in the family. Conscience, policy, and doctrinal ambition united to inflame their hearts against the teachings, abominable practices, and pernicious example of these COMMUNISTIC FREE-LOVERS.

3. With all these commendable intellectual principles and mechanical works and religious forms they were not in a justified state. God held a charge against them. The justified soul has "*perfect peace with God.*" (Isa. 26:3; Rom. 5:1.) But to this church he says, "*I have somewhat against thee.*" They were in a low, fallen condition. "Remember from whence *thou art fallen.*" This is much like Paul's language to the Galatians: "*Ye are fallen from grace.*" (Gal. 5:4.) It is precisely like it in sentiment. Many of the Galatians were backslidden, and fallen from grace. So these Ephesians were nearly or quite all fallen, and in a state of condemnation.

(1) Hence they needed a heart-work. Every

man in this his moral condition needs another work to bring him up to the "*first love*," the moral purity which he once enjoyed by consequence of regeneration.

(2) But the work they needed is not called a second work. The divine command is, "Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and *do thy first works*." Not a second work on their part to get a second divine work, but first works on their part (repent and trust) to obtain a first work, or "*first love*," from God on *his* part.

(3) Thus we see their former moral state was not counted as of any value whatever. Their first experience was nothing, because it was lost. It was everything at the time of it; but now, being lost, it was nothing.

(4) But the thing that was lost was all they lacked to make them just what God wanted them to be. It was not something "of a different kind and infinitely greater than any before, and than any can conceive till he experience it," as Mr. Wesley says (C. P., page 23), that they needed to bring them up to God's standard of perfection. It was simply their "first love." It was just what they obtained when God regenerated them and spoke peace to their souls. It was not a double birth, such as Mr. Wesley and his disciples in doctrine teach (C. P., page 8) that they needed, but

simply what they had obtained by one moral birth.

(5) They were not so bad as those "carnal, envious, contentious," backslidden Corinthians, who are by the double-birth theologians called regenerate, and said to be only in need of the second work. Yet they (Ephesians) were required to "repent and do the first works" in order to obtain peace with God, and avert his impending wrath in the removal of all gospel light. They must take initiatory steps to become Christians. Yet they are not here accused of "carnality, envy, contention," or any other form of "babyishness," as were the backslidden portion of the Corinthian church. But their doctrinal zeal and intellectual attainments, their judicious discrimination, in short, their superiority in the intellectual and mechanical parts of religion was highly commended. Yet they must take the "first steps" to become Christians.

4. This case affords a sufficient answer to Bishop Castle's inquiry in the *Religious Telescope* of September 11, 1878. The Bishop says:

"If holiness be the *ultimatum* of the Christian church, then, I ask, where is it to-day? Is its life an exponent of the grace? Why this wail all over christendom that comes from dissatisfied hearts which still rest in the dissatisfaction? Have

all thus complaining, who have professed regeneration, been deceived? Or have they been regenerated and then backslidden? Or have they been regenerated and failed to go on to perfect love that casteth out fear?"

With the change of a solitary monosyllable, the bishop's last three sentences fairly represent two classes named. Let his last sentence say "Failed to go on *in* perfection," and he will have it right. There are certainly two classes of church-members,—those who WERE "DECEIVED," and those who ARE BACKSLIDDEN by failing to go on IN perfection. They "*have left their first love.*" They need to "*repent, and do the first works.*"

Many are backslidden and blind to the fact, fancying, like the Laodiceans, that they are "rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and know not that they are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." (Rev. 3: 17.) These also were backslidden.

When second-work preachers meet with such churches they generally succeed well in their peculiar line for a time. A little labor will show their members that their hearts do not harmonize with the requirements of God's word. They very well know that they were once converted. A very small quantity of flattery (most men can take flattery in large doses) will induce the belief that

they are as good as they ever were. A dose, well compounded and proportioned, of this flattery in regard to their faithfulness to the grace and light hitherto possessed, and of stern, earnest exhortation in regard to the Bible standard of holiness, will set them seeking not for the first love which they long since lost, but for a finer article, for the superior kind, for an article "of a different kind and infinitely greater than any before." They sometimes have awful struggles, just as backsliders deserve to have, and as backsliders' darkness, mixed with second-work darkness always produces. After desperate struggles, hopes, and fears thay finally surrender all into the hand of a merciful Redeemer, just as they did at the first, and all is peace again. After so dire a struggle and schooling they learn watchfulness in good earnest. They now more easily remember the command, "Pray without ceasing," and feel a deeper necessity for practice. Having learned in the dire school of experience, their feet have become more wary. They cling with a greater tenacity to the Rock of their salvation, and are less liable to fall. They are in the way, just as before they backslid; and no one can be more in than simply in. But they now walk with a much greater wariness and proportionally less liability to slide out of the way. They are less liable to

have their "ups and downs," which some unwisely tell us we all must have.

5. We clearly see now that Christians may—and many do—fall from grace. Not only so; but men may be in the backslidden state without really knowing the fact, and deceive themselves (with Satan's careful help) by means of doctrinal and sectarian zeal and religious forms. We may fancy that we "*are rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing*," when we are, in fact "*wretched and miserable*, [that is, in a deplorable condition,] *and poor, and blind*, [not seeing our condition,] *and naked*,"—destitute of the robe of righteousness. This is a point which seems to be practically ignored by the writers of the doctrine under review.

Mr. Wesley's Concession,

In which he exposes not only his want of careful attention to the matter of backsliding, but also his want of implicit confidence in his own theory, deserves attention now. He says:

"What! total resignation to the will of God, without any mixture of self-will? Gentleness without any touch of anger, even the moment we are provoked? Love to God without the least love to the creature, but in and for God, excluding all pride? Love to man, excluding all envy, all jealousy, and rash judging? Meekness, keeping

the whole soul inviolably calm? And temperance in all things? Deny that any ever came up to this, if you please; but do not say all who are justified do.

"Q. But some who are newly justified do. What, then, will you say to these?

"Answer. If they really do, I will say they are sanctified, saved from sin in that moment, and that they never need lose what God has given, or feel sin any more. But certainly this is an exempt case. It is otherwise with the generality of those that are justified. They feel in themselves more or less pride, self-will, and a heart bent to backsliding. And till they have gradually mortified these, they are not fully renewed in love." (C. P., pages 38, 39.)

1. Here we see that Mr. Wesley does not deny, but actually acknowledges that in some cases—which he is pleased to call "exempt cases"—the soul is fully saved from all sin in the moment of justification.

(1) This is a surrender of his "second-work" doctrine. He is not able to deny that at least in "exempt cases" the new-born soul is purified and endued with all the Christian graces in full measure and degree.

(2) One of two things is certain now: Either God observes no regular method in the regenera-

tion of souls, or else Mr. Wesley is incorrect when he says "they are exempt cases" in which persons "are sanctified and saved from all sin in the moment of justification."

(3) Are we to suppose that God has no regular method in regenerating souls; that he begets some pure and others impure?

(4) And if he begets his children thus variously, some bearing his image purely and others having it mixed with sin, [Wesley says, "All sin is the work of the devil,"] a very important question arises; namely, How did Mr. Wesley find it out? God has not revealed it so. He tells us that "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into the same Spirit." This indicates one regular, invariable method. Mr. Wesley is mistaken. There are certainly no "exempt cases." The cases are all alike. "God's ways are equal."

(5) Mr. Wesley's theory, as we now clearly see, is obviously based not on God's infallible word, but on Mr. Wesley's fallible observations. According to his observation "the generality of those that are justified feel in themselves more or less pride, self-will, and a heart bent to backsliding." If this were correct, then God's general rule must be to beget children with "a heart bent to back-

sliding;" and his exemption rule must be to beget some pure and holy. This places God's work in a most slanderous light. It makes God partial in his dealings with his creatures. "God is no respecter of persons." (Acts 10: 34.)

(6) Some of the more modern doctors of the double-birth divinity make dreadful havoc of their father's position on the regenerate soul's tendency to backsliding.

Dr. Wood says, "Does a state of justification involve a desire to be holy? It does. If a man is a Christian, and in a justified state, he will have the heart of a child of God, and desire to render to him a present, full, and unreserved obedience. This is implied in the very nature of true religion." (P. L., page 212.)

Dr. J. T. Peck says, "Regeneration in its lowest state loves holiness, and pants to be filled with it."

Dr. Daniel Steele says, "Every justified person is a saint, and is advancing toward entire sanctification, and is earnestly panting after it." (Private letter, Feb. 21, 1880.)

Dr. Caughey says, "A hearty desire for purity is the brightest gem that sparkles in real justification. * * It is inseparably attached to it."

Here are four of Mr. Wesley's disciples on the main question who flatly contradict their father

in regard to the regenerate heart being bent on backsliding. If they are correct, Mr. Wesley is surely wrong; for the heart that is panting for holiness surely can not be "bent to backsliding," and *vice versa*. And if they are incorrect, this will not prove Mr. Wesley correct.

(7) His statements involve great inconsistency. He builds his theory, as we have seen, not on the Bible, but on his own observation. He declares upon his own observation that "the hearts of the justified are bent on backsliding." If he observed them before they were backslidden, how could he know that they were bent on backsliding, seeing that the only thing on which he could base such an opinion was not yet in existence? If he observed them after they were backslidden, then they were not proper exponents of the regenerate heart, seeing that they were no longer in the regenerate state.

And right here is the explanation of Mr. Wesley's WHOLE PRODIGIOUS BLUNDER relative to this great question. *He has judged the regenerate heart by the heart and conduct of the backslider.* Whoever examines his use of I. Cor. 3:1–3, and Gal. 5:17, will see that his eyes were blinded by gazing at the backslider, and mistaking him for a Christian. This grave blunder led him astray, and is ruining multitudes throughout christendom. It is the prin-

cipal means by which the double-birth doctrine is kept in vogue. It is also the principal means by which the standard of true piety is kept down on a level with the wishes and lusts of the carnal mind. The carnal eyes, the vitiated taste, the blinded reason, the perverted judgment, and the corrupt motives of backslidden members are made the umpires of ethics in the churches to a disgraceful and destructive extent. The consequence is that a very large percentage of the so-called conversions in the churches are bogus, consisting of a conviction of being on the broad road, a resolution to start for heaven, a slight thrill of the nervous system by the new resolution, the enrollment of names, church-melody and church-flattery. The Holy-Ghost baptism, by which alone the soul is brought into the family, the favor, the fellowship, and the kingdom of God, is not expected, not prayed for, not waited for, and consequently not experienced. But another name is written on the church-roll, and another advocate of mechanical religion is in the field. Another conscience has been lulled to sleep. But no heart has been added to the number of regenerates, no strength to the army of God.

(8) Mr. Wesley is obviously inconsistent with himself when he judges that the "regenerate heart is bent to backsliding," and is therefore wanting

in moral purity,—"full of sin,"—simply upon his own observation that they do backslide; for he attributes precisely the same thing to those who he claims have received the second work. Speaking of "those who are perfect in love," he says, "Neither does any one stand by virtue of anything that is implied in the nature of the state. * * Nay, it is an exceeding common thing for persons to lose it more than once, before they are established therein." (C. P., page 43.) In another place he says, "God does not give them a stock of holiness. But unless they receive a supply every moment, nothing but unholiness would remain." (Page 32.)

a. If these statements are true, we may well inquire, Wherein does the superiority of the "second work" over the first consist, allowing Mr. Wesley to be judge? According to his view they appear to be both "bent to backsliding."

b. If the regenerate heart "is bent to backsliding," and if "it is exceeding common for those who are perfect in love to lose it more than once before they are established therein," it seems passing strange that Mr. Wesley could not see the almost unmistakable evidences in Paul's letters to the Corinthians and Galatians, that some of the members of those churches were backslidden. And our astonishment at the acuteness of Mr. Wesley's

vision in the one class of cases and blindness in the other, becomes greater when we consider the following expression from his pen. He says, "As a very little dust will disorder a clock, and the least sand will obscure our sight, so the least grain of sin, which is upon the heart, will hinder its right motion toward God.' (C. P., page 54.)

According to this the least sin in the heart makes its motions wrong and displeasing to God; yet a soul full of abominations, pride, hell, and Satan can enjoy the sweet smiles of his approbation and an heirship to eternal glory, according to Mr. Wesley.

"O CONSISTENCY, THOU ART A JEWEL."

OBJECTION 27.

THE DOUBLE-BIRTH DOCTRINE NEEDS SUPPORT FROM SOPHISTRY.

Besides the numerous contradictions of the Scriptures, contradictions of one another, self-contradictions and sophistries employed by the double-birth theologians, and brought under review in the preceding pages, it may not be amiss to present yet the following by way of showing more fully the beggarly character of the doctrine, as well as preparing the reader more fully to meet the vast array of absurdities to be met by the advocates of truth.

PROFESSOR THOMAS C. UPHAM, ON "GROWTH IN HOLINESS."

He says, "That a thing may be perfect in its nature, and yet be susceptible of growth or advancement in degree, is, I suppose, a matter of common observation. An oak, when it first rises above the surface of the ground, is so small and weak that it may easily be trodden under foot; and yet it is as really and truly an oak as when it subsequently stands forth in the strength and stature of a hundred years. A human being is in his nature as much human being in the period of infancy, as in the subsequent expansion and growth of manhood. * * * Illustrations and facts of this kind seem to make it clear that the spiritually renovated state of mind, which is variously called holiness, perfect love, and sanctification, may be susceptible of growth or increase. * * * We may lay it down as a general truth, that perfection in the nature of a thing is requisite to perfection in degree. And accordingly, although it is possible for a person who is partially holy to grow in holiness, a person who is entirely holy, although he may be assailed by unfavorable influences outwardly, will grow much more." (Interior Life, pages 267, 268.)

1. With such arguments before us we do well to remember that holiness does not consist in mag-

nitude nor strength of muscle or intellect. A man may be very large and stout physically, and possess a very powerful intellect, and yet be a very bad man. Another may be very diminutive in muscle, and feeble in intellect, and yet possess a pure heart. Some angels are mightier than others, and yet they are all holy in heaven.

2. The question at issue, then, is not as to whether a man's muscle may grow and strengthen, nor whether his intellect may become stronger, or his knowledge increase, but whether his holiness may grow and increase. Not whether the soul may become stronger after its purification, but whether its PURITY may become PURER, its HOLINESS HOLIER, its RIGHTEOUSNESS MORE righteous. After the soul is made perfectly pure, can it still undergo the process of purification?

3. Holiness is moral purity, freedom from sin and loving God with all its powers, "*pure love reigning alone in the heart.*" The professor says the soul may be "partially holy," that in this partially holy state its holiness may grow; but when it becomes perfectly holy its holiness "will grow much more." That is to say, that when a thing has become perfectly clean, the process of its cleansing may proceed more rapidly than it did before. Can pollution be more rapidly removed where it has been so thoroughly removed that the object is

perfectly clean and there is no more pollution remaining than it was before? This is what the professor seems to think his illustrations prove. But when we look directly at them for ourselves, we see that they prove precisely the reverse. The oak is not more purely an oak at the end of two centuries' growth, than it was when it could be crushed with the foot. The human being is not more purely human at the age and strength of thirty years, than when in the infantile cradle. The tree and the child may grow in stature and strength, but their natures do not grow. They have precisely the same generic and specific natures at full maturity as when in infancy. So the Christian's nature is the same pure Christian nature in the first moment of his divine heirship as at the end of scores of years of growth. He needed a change of moral nature, and has obtained it; now his moral nature is divine—he is a "partaker of the divine nature." (II. Peter 1 : 4.)

That divine moral nature can not become more divine, for the same reason that an oak can not become more oaken, nor a human being become more human. Thus the pious professor's illustrations are obviously against his position.

4. The sophism here under review has been used times without number to pave the way for the use of all scriptures relating to Christian

growth,* in the interest of the double-birth theology. It is high time that we should brush away such mists, and look at the truth for ourselves.

PRESIDENT ASA MAHAN'S MISTAKES ON PARTIAL FAITH deserves attention here.

This excellent man says, 1. "We may repose confidence in one, and not in every feature of Christ's character as a Savior. For example, the mind, in consequence of the ignorance of the perfect fullness of Christ's redemption in all respects, may repose full confidence in Christ as a justifying, but not as a sanctifying Savior. 2. For the same reason the mind may repose confidence in Christ, for sustaining grace in one condition in life, and not in another. We may, for example, expect Christ to bless us in our closets, but not in the midst of our business transactions. The faith of all such persons *is imperfect*. *Perfect faith, on the other hand*, is a full and unshaken confidence in Christ, as in all respects, at all times, and in every condition, a full and perfect Savior, a Savior able and willing to meet every possible demand of our being." (Scrip. Doc. Chris. Perf., Dis. IV.)

Against the president's view *on imperfect faith* I bring,

1. The testimony of three popular double-birth theologians, namely, Mr. J. Hoke, Dr. J. A. Wood,

*See "OBJECTION 28."

and Dr. Daniel Steel. If these excellent gentlemen all testify against their own doctrine as well as against their brother theologian's hypothesis of *partial faith*, that is none of my business. I quote from autograph letters open before me.

Mr. Hoke, under date of January 31, 1880, says, "In regard to the question, 'Can a soul obtain pardon—justification on partial faith?' I answer, No. Faith in every case must be *full* and *perfect* or it is not faith at all."

Dr. Wood says, "No one is justified on *partial* faith." (Feb. 2, 1880.)

Dr. Steel, under date of Feb. 21, 1880, says, "*I do not know what partial faith is.* * * * The penitent who has faith enough in Christ to trust in him, and him only, will be pardoned. The soul that consciously withholds anything from God can not exercise saving faith."

These excellent gentlemen are correct in the statements just quoted; but they are not consistent with their own doctrine. It assumes the idea of *imperfect partial faith*. The president is consistent with the doctrine which he and they all hold, but inconsistent with the Bible.

2. The Bible nowhere teaches that the soul can obtain pardon on a partial or an imperfect faith. The command is, "*Trust in the Lord with all thine heart.*" Philip said to the Ethiopian, "*If thou be-*

lievest with all thine heart, thou mayest." All the heart handed over to Christ as a living, all-sufficient Savior, is required of every soul as an invariable prerequisite to pardon. And this is all that it can do as a prerequisite to *any* grace of the Holy Spirit.

3. The president surely differs with Isaiah in assuming that the soul must clearly comprehend "every feature of Christ's character and the perfect fullness of Christ's redemption in all respects," before it can exercise the faith that brings sanctification. Isaiah says, "The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." The sin-sick soul submits fully its case to the great Physician, without the least apprehension that it is expected either to understand fully the nature and extent of its disease, or the nature and extent of the physician's powers or his remedy; much less is it expected to comprehend the infinite character of the great Physician. If angels can not fully comprehend either the Author of salvation or his wondrous plan in its fathomless depths, how can the unsanctified soul do so?

4. The president assumes the very point in dispute, the very point to be proved, and takes it as an illustration to establish another point which he wishes to use as an argument in support of the assumed main point. His argument runs about

like this, Black is white. To illustrate, orange is yellow, and indigo is blue; therefore black is white.

5. He makes use of the well-known fact that the soul can not to-day believe for to-morrow, in order to establish the idea that the "mind may repose confidence in Christ, for sustaining grace in one condition in life, and not in another." We can not to-day exercise faith for to-morrow, any more than an Israelite could gather manna on Tuesday morning to last him over Wednesday and Thursday. Jesus teaches us to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread." But he never teaches us to do up our praying and trusting now for any future period. *We must now trust for now.* Now is all the time we ever have or shall have. To-morrow is never now. When we cease trusting Christ as our physician, he ceases keeping us in health. "The just shall live by faith." "You do take away my life when you do take away that by which I live." "Abide in me, and I [will abide] in you." "He that believeth not is condemned already," not because he failed yesterday, or may to-morrow, but because he *fails now* to trust all in Jesus' hand. Peter walked on the surface of the blue Galilee while he trusted his Lord. Doubting caused the God-man to withdraw his sustaining power. Gravitation drew the doubter downward.

When he saw himself in the forlorn condition of sinking,—which fitly illustrates the backslider,—he, like those backsliders who seek the "second work," cried desperately for help. The once sinking doubter, now trusting all as at first, finds himself walking on the surface again, as do those who claim the second work.

THE THIRD SOPHISM WE NOTICE IS THAT WHICH IS BUILT ON THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF HOLINESS.

1. It is well known that Dr. J. Calvin denied the attainability of holiness in this life.

2. It is also well known that Mr. J. Wesley affirmed what Calvin denied, declaring that "even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin," and that the heart may attain to a state of perfect moral purity in this life, and continue therein.

3. Every believer of the Bible necessarily holds to one of these opinions and rejects the other. Thus the Christian world is divided into two classes, respecting these two opposite doctrines.

4. Yet there are very many in each of these two classes who do not fully indorse either Calvin or Wesley on all points of their respective systems of doctrine.

5. But many of those who can see no other religious leader but John Wesley, can see no imperfection in his system. They think there can be no consistency in taking a part of his system and rejecting a part, seeing that, as they suppose, both the man and his system are perfect. Therefore they indorse him without limitation.

6. Thus taking another man's eyes and ears and judgment and understanding as the only legitimate medium for the influx of religious ideas to their souls, their own senses naturally enough go into disuse and become pitifully dwarfed.

7. The consequence is that whatever the Bible says, it seems to them to say in unlimited indorsement of John Wesley. Hence, of course, all it says in favor of the doctrine of the present attainability of holiness is by these parasites understood as teaching the necessity of the "second work" or double moral birth; for Mr. Wesley expressly declares that "if there be no such second change, if there be no instantaneous deliverance after regeneration, then we must content ourselves, as well as we can, to remain full of sin till death."

8. Now it is very easy to find abundance of passages in the Bible teaching the doctrine of the present attainability of holiness; therefore all such passages are carefully conscripted and pressed into

the service of the double-birth theory, as if it were utterly impossible for them to have any other meaning, seeing that Mr. Wesley so understood and so interpreted them.

9. To such an extent has this sophistry been promulgated that multitudes of good minds are to-day enshrouded in the dismal cloud.

They can not find it in the Bible of God; they could not find it in their experience after long and earnest seeking, yet the Bible requires present holiness. God offers it now, but John Wesley says it can only be obtained by a second, separate, distinct change or birth, after regeneration of a different kind and infinitely greater; therefore the Bible must mean this, for Mr. Wesley says so, and he could not be mistaken.

Hence they are crushed beneath this cloud of sophistry, and made to feel that it would be a crime to possess sanctification, holiness, or perfect love, for Dr. Calvin declares that no one can make such an attainment in this life, and Mr. Wesley says it can only be obtained by a double birth. Thus many are thrown into despair, others into infidelity. But a vast multitude, escaping these, fall into the awful opinion, for which Satan is now struggling harder than for any other means of destruction, namely, the popular belief that a man can be both a Christian and a sinner at the same

time. This is the most extensively received opinion now extent in christendom, excepting only a general kind of belief in the Bible. Men will argue for a mongrel Christianity who would be greatly offended if accused of believing in it. This I have ascertained by actual experiment with bright minds. The bewilderment on this point is simply astounding. Ask any one of a large majority of professing Christians, "Sir, do you believe in the existence of such a being as a Christian-sinner?" and he will think you are jesting. Divert his attention from the point, and approach it from another quarter, and ask him whether he believe in the attainability of a sinless, moral state, and he will promptly answer, "No." You will find such self-contradiction in the minds of some of the most learned theologians in christendom. The amazing bewilderment has arisen out of the sophistry under review, in connection with the very *convenient* item in the systems of both Calvin and Wesley; namely, that a man may be a Christian and full of sin at the same time.

10. One of the evils growing out of the sophistry under review is the bitter fact that all who speak a word against the double-birth theory are *forthwith branded as opposers of holiness.* Those who inflict the brand arrogate to themselves the pretentious title of

"HOLINESS PEOPLE,"

and call their meetings by the pretentious name of

"HOLINESS MEETINGS,"

as if they were the only holy people on earth, and their meetings the only ones for the promotion of holiness; whereas it ought to be understood that every Christian is a holy person, and every Christian meeting a holiness meeting. It ought moreover to be understood that God's Bible teaches present attainable holiness without the double birth. One birth from God the holy, the pure, the most lovely secures a state of holiness to the soul.

11. Let every soul beware of the sophistry which argues the double-birth doctrine from everything which favors holiness. And let the sophists beware of branding the opposers of double birth with the *false accusation that they oppose holiness*. And let the opposers of the double moral birth doctrine be careful to use no weapon but "the sword of the Spirit," rejecting all carnal weapons and all malice. Let all beware of adding to or taking from the holy word of the omniscient God.

OBJECTION 28.

THE DOUBLE-BIRTH THEOLOGY PERVERTS THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF GROWTH IN GRACE, AND CONFUSES THE MIND IN REGARD TO IT.

It is just to remember that this objection lies heavier against the conduct of its advocates than it does against the doctrine itself. Yet a thorough examination of our subject requires that we notice our present objection under a distinct head. We shall, in doing so, get a clearer and broader view of the contradictions and subterfuges to which its advocates feel themselves obliged to resort from destitution of scripture evidence.

1. At one time they will boldly declare, as Dr. J. A. Wood does, that "holiness is not obtained by growth in grace." * * Growing in grace is not the process of separating sin from the soul either before or after entire sanctification. * * Its extermination is not to be looked for by growth in grace, but through creating, cleansing power." (Page 61.)

Mr. Wesley says, "I believe this perfection *is always* wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith, consequently in an *instant*. *To talk of this work as being gradual would be nonsense.*" (P. L., p. 65.)

(1) These expressions would lead the mind to the just conclusion that the state of perfect moral

purity is invariably wrought in the heart by an instantaneous act of divine power.

(2) They would also lead to the conclusion that whenever the work which they call "entire sanctification" is wrought in the heart it is brought into a state of perfect moral purity—a state in which there is a total absence of all moral defilement. On this point Bishop Castle is very explicit. Quoting Bishop Hedding he says, "Regeneration is the beginning of purification; entire sanctification is the finishing of that work." (Answer 4.)

They all agree that entire sanctification occurs at the time of what they call the second work. Entire sanctification, they tell us, constitutes the second work. This, then, the two bishops just quoted tell us, finishes the work of purification. Thus we have these eminent divines, Wesley, Wood, Castle, and Hedding all teaching that the process of moral purification never proceeds gradually, but always instantaneously. And they also agree that at the second effort of divine energy—which they hold is essential to entire sanctification,—the process of purification is perfectly completed.

2. But when these same divines are driven to the wall from want of evidence in support of their double-birth doctrine as a whole, they become so

anxious to impress us with the idea that moral perfection is never reached in regeneration, but must be subsequently made a special object of pursuit, and a distinct attainment, they seem to forget the ideas of instantaneity and completeness, and become much engrossed with gradual and even perpetual progress. Then you will hear them saying, "If to be in Christ is at once the securing in actual experience of all that he is, then we are certainly at a dead-lock in the line of progress, and must henceforth lack the incentives to further endeavor." (Bishop Castle, *Tel.*, April 30, 1879.)

Then you will hear Dr. Wood saying, "Simple purity or holiness is but a low state of grace compared to being 'filled with all the fullness of God.' * * The great measure of our advancement in holiness should be subsequent to the purification, the utter extirpation of sin from our hearts. * * * Growth in grace is principally subsequent to being cleansed from all sin." (P. L., page 219.)

Then you will hear Mr. Wesley saying, "The generality of those that are justified feel in themselves more or less pride, self-will, and a heart bent to backsliding. *And till they have gradually mortified these they are not fully renewed in love.*" (C. P., pages 38, 39.) (We remember about "*nonsense.*")

(1) Dr. Wood would have come nearer correct-

ness if he had said "growth in grace is *entirely* subsequent to being cleansed from all sin."

(2) But he not only contradicts reason, common sense, and all true metaphysics, but even Dr. J. A. Wood, when he says, "The great measure of our advancement in * * holiness should be subsequent to the purification, the utter extirpation of sin from our hearts."

a. He tells us purity is holiness.

b. He tells us elsewhere that all sin is extirpated, and the heart made perfectly pure and holy at sanctification.

c. He tells us that after this "utter extirpation of sin from our hearts the great measure of our advancement in holiness should be made." This would make an advancement in holiness a continuing process. 1. This is contradictory to statements above quoted from this same author, in which he declares the work of moral cleansing to be instantaneous. 2. It also involves an impossibility—the idea of continuing the process of extirpation after there is nothing left to extirpate. Mark, holiness is moral purity. Moral purity is achieved by the extirpation of sin or moral impurity. Growth in holiness therefore would consist in the extirpation of sin. This, he tells us, is principally accomplished after the extirpation of sin has been entirely completed.

This is as absurd as it would be to talk of grubbing briers day after day from a field that has just been made perfectly free from all briers and their roots. A boy tells his father, "I have grubbed every brier and every other root out of that field. It is now perfectly clean from every root." "Very well," says the father, "now that field is in the right condition to grow cleaner and freer from briers and their roots. You see, my son, when the briers have been utterly extracted and exterminated from a field, so that it is perfectly clean, then is the time when the process of cleansing can proceed with the greatest facility. So now, my boy, you will go right on grubbing briers from that field." Where is the boy who would not, in such a case, commence seriously considering how near the time must be when his dear father would be separated from his family and taken to the lunatic asylum. How much would the boy be relieved of his solicitude if the father should assign as a reason for his suggestion the one assigned by Bishop Castle, as quoted above, and say, "You see, my dear child, if we should now consider that field perfectly clean, 'then we are certainly at a dead-lock in the line of progress, and must henceforth lack the incentives to further endeavor.'" The boy could easily reply, "Why, father, we can find ample scope for our endeavors in growing wheat on that

field, without pretending to grub briers when there are none." But the boy would not likely feel very talkative in view of his father's loss of rationality.

These theologians are continually telling us that the "second work" takes out all the roots of bitterness from the heart, making it perfectly clean and free from everything of the kind, that this work is performed instantaneously, and that the cleansing process never proceeds gradually. And yet they will tell us that "although it is possible for a person who is partially holy to grow in holiness, a person who is entirely holy will grow much more." (Upham's Interior Life, page 268.)

Thus they have the work of growing in grace to consist in the gradual growth of holiness, the growth of a quality or of a condition of our moral nature, in the extraction and extermination of roots from a field where they have been utterly exterminated.

Mr. Wesley, who, as we have seen, declares that "to talk of this work as being gradual would be nonsense," elsewhere declares of the perfectly sanctified, holy soul, "Yet he still grows in the image of God, and will do so, not only till death, but probably to all eternity." (C. P., page 23.) The moral image of God is "righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. 4: 24.)

To grow in the image of God, therefore, is to grow in holiness; and to grow in this image through life and eternity would certainly be a perpetual, gradual growth in holiness. This would involve the idea of a perpetual extraction and extermination of roots from a field where they were all exterminated in the start.

Thus Mr. Wesley, like Dr. Wood and Professor Upham, contradicts all reason, all true metaphysics, and Mr. Wesley too. Thus he talks what he calls nonsense. And thus the mind is confused in regard to the Bible doctrine of growth in grace.

The sacred word says, "*As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby.*" (I. Peter 2: 2.) "*Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.*" (II. Peter 3: 18.) Paul said to the church at Thessalonica, "*Your faith groweth exceedingly.*" I read also, "*The righteous shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon.*" (Psalms 92: 12.)

But I read also of the Messiah that "*He shall grow up before him as a tender plant.*" (Isa. 53: 2.) "*Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.*" (Luke 2: 52.) Jesus was always purely holy. Hence we know that his holiness never improved. Hence we see that a person may grow without his holiness growing. *Holiness never grows.* We never read of its growth

in the sacred word. As truth can never grow truer, and righteousness can never grow better, so purity can never grow purer nor holiness holier. Spots can not be removed from the spotless, nor briers from the brierless. The apple-tree that is so small that a single apple would crush it, is just as thoroughly and completely an apple-tree as the tree of a century's growth under a crop of forty bushels of apples. So the Christian of an hour's age is as pure as the patriarch of a century's growth. WHAT THEN IS MEANT BY GROWING IN GRACE?

ANSWER.

1. GROWTH IN KNOWLEDGE.

1. Satan can destroy the soul only by deception; just as in the garden, so now.

2. To escape his devices, snare, and corruption, requires knowledge and a vigilant use of it. "*Watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation.*"

3. A knowledge of the danger of backsliding and a constant remembrance of it is the first thing in order for the converted soul. Whenever he thinks he is perfectly secure and needs no vigilance, nor the constant help of God to keep him from defilement, backsliding, and ruin, then his danger is exceedingly great. He is sure to fall, unless he quickly learn his mistake, and as quick-

ly set his guard strong and vigilant against the mighty destroyer.

4. A knowledge of the best means and methods of working for the glory of God will be both interesting and important to the new-born soul. "*Whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.*" "*Covet earnestly the best gifts.*"

God has no place for idlers. Satan is against God, against his kingdom, his children, and his glory. The soul that is for God is as surely against Satan. Jesus puts a sword into his hand. This is "*the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.*" With this he learns how to defend himself, and how to rescue others from Satan. Thus he adds to the number of lovers and worshipers of his God, the strength of his kingdom, and the quantity of his glory. Here is scope for all the powers of body and of mind he has or can have. To wield the sword effectively requires study, energy, and perseverance. He who loves God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself, will delight in doing all he can for the glory of the one and the salvation of the other. *He who has not a burning zeal for God's kingdom and glory and the salvation of souls either never was converted, or is backslidden badly.* Such is the case with multitudes who are called Christians. *They have a name*

to live, and are dead. They spend their strength, time, talent, and money for their own gratification in pursuit of the riches, honors, and pleasures of this world. They are "*carnal, sold under sin.*" They have lost their first love, if they ever had any, and must repent, and do their first work, or soon be left entirely without moral light, and so go down in delusion to ruin. Satan's great delight is to deceive all such with the notion that they are Christians. Hence his mighty struggle to blind the theologians, teachers of the people, and through them the people, with the idea that a man may be a Christian on his way to glory and a carnal lover of the world at the same time. This is one of the first and most important deceptions to guard against. "With all thy getting, get understanding." "Buy the truth and sell it not." "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior." "*Light is sown for the righteous.*" (Ps. 97:11.)

A dozen workmen may hire to a farmer, and be equally devoted to his interests and faithful in their duties; yet some may be greatly inferior to others as laborers, from want of knowledge, strength, or agility. He may regard them with equal confidence and affection. But he can not so highly prize the most awkward, who, with all his good intentions, frequently breaks tools, for-

gets to close gates, forgets to feed or water his team, breaks or bruises fruit-trees, &c., &c., as he does that most experienced one who seldom ever forgets to do the right thing at the right time and in the right manner, and never breaks tools or injures trees. And if the final reward of the workmen were to consist in a public exhibition of a statistical report of all their work and the profit which they brought into the farmer's treasury, there would be a great difference in the honors which would rest on the laborers from public sentiment.

"The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall *reward every man according to his works.*" (Matt. 16: 27.) "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And *they that be wise* shall *shine* as the brightness of the *firmament;* and *they that turn many to righteousness,* as the *stars* forever and ever." (Dan. 12: 2, 3.) The firmament is beautiful; the stars shine brighter. They will all be honored and happy who enter heaven. But they will have greatest honor who gather most sheaves in proportion to opportunities and inherited ability. Some improve, while others bury their native talents. Some seek opportunities for doing good,

while others close their eyes when they are presented. *God sees all, and records it.* The great day will reveal the record. Thenceforth the books will be perpetually open for inspection. They will show *facts.* If Paul won ten thousand souls to the love of Christ, and James won two hundred, the book will not show ten thousand won by James and only two hundred by Paul. This would be falsehood. The book will show only truth.

2. Grow in faith.

Faith may be said to grow in two respects.

1. In the range or extent of its vision. As our knowledge of God, his ways, his works, his word, his promises, and the plan of his government increases, we take a more extensive view of the vast field of privilege lying before us. At first we may conceive it to be our privilege to expect God to provide for our spiritual wants, but pay no special attention to our temporal interests, nor our intellectual wants.

2. No child of God doubts the infinity of his divine Father in every good attribute. He could never make the complete surrender of himself into His hands, which alone can render it consistent for God to stoop and save him, unless he first possessed unlimited confidence in His all-sufficiency. Without this it would be simply im-

possible to make such a surrender. In this all Christians are precisely alike. They all came to this point of unlimited, unwavering confidence in God before they surrendered and became his children. But they differ in two particulars: 1. They vastly differ in their knowledge of their privileges. 2. They may equally differ in the constancy of their trusting themselves in the hands of God. The latter difference grows out of the former. While one man is a Christian steadily, day after day, trusting his all in God's hands incessantly, and enjoying incessantly the fulfillment of the promise, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee" (Isa. 26: 3), the other enjoys this peace to-day, because he trusts in God; but to-morrow he is a condemned sinner, because he does not trust him, but falls into fear of the world, fear of losses of property, honor, or health, fear of want and misery, fears to do right against the opinions of men, fears to honor Jesus in the presence of scoffers. As a consequence, he takes his case and the management of his affairs into his own hands, runs on his own track,—or rather on Satan's track,—compromises with the world, and provokes God with his attitude of self-sufficiency and independence. Now he may cling to religious forms and profession with the utmost

tenacity, persuading himself, by means of the blind theologians and Satan in concert, that he is a Christian. But God says, "*The fear of man bringeth a snare;* but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe." (Prov. 28: 25.) "*He that believeth not is condemned already.*" (John 3: 18.) "But the *fearful*, and *unbelieving*, and the abominable, and murderers, * * and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall *have their part* in the lake which burneth with *fire* and *brimstone*: which is the second death." (Rev. 21: 8.)

Thus we see that doubt and its consequent fearfulness bring speedy condemnation to the soul. It dishonors God, and leads the soul into compromise with Satan, so plunging it into impurity. By the blind world a "little doubting" is considered a small thing; but with God it is seen in its destructive character. What the world calls doubting is by the omniscient Eye seen to be distrust—not a disbelief in the faithfulness, goodness, or all-sufficiency of God, but an actual taking of their case out of his hands to conduct and control it themselves, and thus have their own way with it. This arises from their narrow view of the field of privilege, in part, in the first backward motion; from unwatchfulness against improper feelings, wishes, motives, affections, and thoughts; from Satan's sly and stealthy insinuations; from

forgetfulness in the matter of prayer, and consequent walking alone instead of walking, in Enoch's style, with God; from neglect of duty, and consequent self-reproach; from reluctance and consequent delay in the matter of frank and full confession to God of guilt in these inadvertent neglects and wanderings. "*Beloved, if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.*"

Whenever a man's heart (conscience) condemns him, it is because he did something contrary to conscience; that is, something which he believed to be wrong. When he did that he indorsed wrong. Every one knows that he has no right to indorse wrong. Hence when he does it he does wrong. Therefore he is guilty. No soul resting in the guilt of unrepented wrong can approach God with the expectation of approving favor. To such, one of two things is inevitable: 1. A humble, frank, full, penitent confession and earnest pleading for mercy, or, 2. a resting in the attitude of rebellion, under condemnation. No matter how small the fault has been, one of these attitudes will follow. And the matter of confession without pleading excuse is the hardest thing for the soul to do. Nothing else is so repulsive. Consequently many rest in the attitude of rebellion by simply postponing the bitter con-

fession. Thus they justify the crime and commit it over and over and over again, by simply refusing prompt, penitent confession. If I should tell a multitude that you have lied, and refuse to recall the vile slander, even though I have many opportunities and earnest solicitations on your part, would my conduct not be equivalent to numerous repetitions of the slander? So the soul, having indulged but in thought and feeling the least wrong, and postponing humble confession before God, repeats continually the sin by refusing to recall it. It is the attitude of independence and of justifying the wrong. It is consenting to let the wrong continue unrecalled. This is a hearty indorsement of the wrong. With God all wrong soul-action, whether great or trivial, is condemned. Condemnation shuts the soul away from God in the cold region of self-reliance. In this region, this barren desert, this dreary waste, many who are called Christians (*and are so occasionally*) spend much of their precious time, and waste many of their precious opportunities for doing good. When they should be strong laborers and teachers they need feeding with milk to give them strength enough to commence doing their first works. Thus they waste their days mostly under mists and clouds of unbelief which arise out of the swamps of *carelessness* and other sins. They

are most of the time engaged in quarrels with God, which they and their false teachers call "unavoidable dark seasons." Once in awhile they come out do their whole duty, and make a full consecration of their all to God. He accepts the offering, fills them with his love, and they run well for a season. Then they vary from God's requirements on some point which seems to them too small to be of any consequence. The ready Satan comes in with his deceitful reasonings, and helps the wavering mind to believe it is too small a matter to require any attention, telling them, "It is all well enough for sanctified folks to be scrupulous and careful about small matters, but Christians of the lower order may do many things which are inconsistent with the higher life and still be Christians. They need not deny themselves so rigidly. It is all well enough where one wants to be perfect; but sinless perfection is what very few, if any, ever attain to in this life." Thus they go down again, and drag along in lifeless forms. Multitudes of this class are annually sinking to rise no more. Others spend their days in the "up and down" career, do very little good in the world, but at last take fright from their desolate condition and escape "so as by fire."

The self-denials incidental to earnest, effective labor for Christ is the stumbling-stone to millions.

"If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily." (Luke 9: 23.) This denying self of worldly pleasures to save time, strength, and means to work for the kingdom of God and immortal souls is what tries the faith of many. The theologians tell them they can be "in Christ and yet carnal." They indulge moderately; and this blinds their eyes and benumbs their moral sensibilities. Then greater indulgence seems like a very small thing, and self-denial seems useless. So they indulge more. The love of the world possesses their hearts. God is driven out. Their religion is crystallized into mechanical forms. What they do now is only to quiet a very stupid conscience and keep up appearances. Opportunities to do good are not looked after, but shunned. Time, talent, money, rank, and position will all be employed to gratify their love of riches, honors, and pleasures. Only enough will be done for God and his cause to perpetuate the slumbers of a stupid conscience and their membership in church.

Some theologians think this class simply need to make "fuller consecration to bring them into a better experience and a higher state of usefulness." But, according to God's holy word, *they need a first consecration to restore their "first love."* They are not consecrated at all, except to them-

selves, the world, and Satan. They are proud, petulant, and sensual, and catalogued by the theologians as "carnal Christians, full of the old man, the hidden abominations, pride, self-will, and hell, yet having the witness in themselves, 'Thou art an heir of God, a joint-heir with Christ." (Wesley.) The Bible says, "*God resisteth the proud.*" They may approach God with their forms of prayer and utter beautiful words, which please the ears of the carnal; but God resists them, and spurns their petitions. However fine the style and appropriate the petitions, they are only the ebullitions of satanic pride, and therefore abominable in the sight of God.

The first effectual thing they can do for the improvement of their faith is a deep, thorough, humble repentance. "*How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only.*" (John 5: 44.)

They who seek the praise of men can not at the same time, in the same attitude of soul, bow in humble submission to God, who positively forbids the love of the world, saying, "*Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.*" (I. John 2: 15.) Pride is a soul-state, the exact opposite of submission, and therefore incompatible with it. Not only so; but it is direct rebellion,

being direct disobedience to God's command. Therefore he who has this feeling of self-exaltation must be abased before he can approach God in the confidence that he will regard with complacency. But "*if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God.* And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." (I. John 3: 21.)

The honest, conscientious soul who is really decided to do God's will in every particular, to glorify his name and labor for the advancement of his kingdom by the rescue of fellow-men from the kingdom of darkness, and who carefully and prayerfully studies his holy word, will find no difficulty in the matter of faith, unless he suffer himself to be confused by certain blind theologians. One class of these may confuse him by setting him to praying for "the second work." Another may do so by setting him to praying for *faith.* Either of these will confuse him. The right way is to search God's word, be decided to do his will, and *trust all in his hand, taking his promises at one hundred per cent.* Believe him, commit all into his hand, and *keep it committed.* "*Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*" (Rom. 10: 17.) Study and obey God's word, and your faith will get along.

3. GROW IN STRENGTH.

"*They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength.*" (Isa. 40: 31.) On the night of his betrayal Jesus said to his disciples, "*Now ye are clean.*" (John 15: 3.) Then they were pure from all sin. But almost the last words he spoke to them before pronouncing his parting blessing were, "*Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high.*" (Luke 24: 49.) After a special, protracted tarrying before God for the space of ten days and ten nights, on the morning of the first day of the week, the inaugural day of the new dispensation was ushered in by the special baptism of power poured out upon about two hundred gentlemen and ladies, who were in constant prayer and expectant waiting for this remarkable fulfillment of the Lord's promise. (See Acts 2.)

The baptism of power should be sought and experienced occasionally by every one. When heavy duties, fiery trials, or sore afflictions are before us, we should seek the baptism of power to prepare us for the emergency. But some have not the faith to believe that such things are for them. Others are too proud to wait in humble prayer and supplication. Some are too careless about the necessary preparation for effectual work for God. They live unto themselves. Paul com-

mands them, "*Covet earnestly the best gifts.*" No; it is not Paul, but God Almighty by the hand of Paul, who utters this command. Yet many professing godliness are too busy coveting worldly goods, and struggling to get them, to spend any time on their knees coveting power to prepare them for effective labor. They hide their worldly-mindedness and religious carelessness under a cloak of modesty, saying, "I have no talents. I am too weak; I am too unworthy to enjoy such extraordinary blessings." Paul said, "*I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.*" God's prophets and apostles were men of great power, and did many wonderful things; but their power was all from God. They obtained it by simple faith; for they were, as James says of Elijah, "subject to like passions as we are." They were not a superior order of beings. The same simple, unwavering trust in God which brought the wonderful answers to their prayers will bring all that we need to honor God and advance his kingdom. The miracles which God wrought by them are not now necessary, since the revelation of God's will in words has been abundantly attested with "signs and wonders and divers miracles."

Yet we have abundant access to the same inexhaustible almighty power by which those miracles were performed, and may draw supplies in precise

ratio to our needs and the needs of God's cause when we make that cause fully ours in the sense of personal partnership; when we are indeed "*laborers together with God.*"

4. GROW IN WATCHFULNESS.

The young convert knows but little of the wiles of Satan, the power of wicked influences around him, or of his own weakness. There is no satanic enemy visible. The world seems friendly,—sometimes too friendly. His love is pure and strong. His purposes are strong. He is unaware that his mortal enemy never proposes to meet him in open field-fight with avowed hostility. He has learned that Satan's only means of destruction is *deception* of one kind or another. He has not learned the important truth which Satan so well understands after many long ages of study and practice in spiteful warfare against God and moral beauty; namely, that *moral qualities can never be produced by physical force.*

Hence he is unaware of the vast importance of those sacred words of caution: "*Be vigilant.*" "*What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch.*" Satan, with the voraciousness of a hungry lion, the vigilance and deceitfulness of a serpent, and slyness and agility of the panther, gives him the sad experiences which, in connection with the warnings of God's word and the quickenings of his

Spirit, arouse him to greater watchfulness. As he sees more clearly the numerous points to be guarded, and Satan's purpose to follow him to the verge of the grave with his hellish intentions, he becomes more seriously and deeply impressed with the importance of ceaseless vigilance. The importance of this can not be exaggerated. This becomes obvious when we consider carefully the numerous means in the power of Satan for the diversion of our attention, for enticement, and for direct deception. When we see men of great intellect, like Solomon after writing some of the wisest sayings, and growing aged in the service of God, yet at last "*led captive by the devil at his will*," and "drawn away of his lusts," under a thick cloud of deception in regard to the corrupting and ruinous effects of sowing to the flesh, and drawn down to endless night with a heart full of lasciviousness and murder, we are admonished to "*watch and pray, lest we enter into temptation.*" When we contemplate the fall of Adam from a state of primeval, sinless purity into the abyss of moral turpitude, and the utter absence of any evidence that he was ever recovered, we feel the force of that warning, "*Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed, lest he fall.*" The fall of holy angels admonishes us, "Beware." Thus the soul grows in the habit of watchfulness.

5. GROWTH IN THE HABIT OF PRAYER will be collateral and commensurate with that of watchfulness, and for the same reasons. As a confiding little boy, who had inadvertently spilled a pail of milk and fallen into it, soiling his best costume, rushed into his loving father's arms, dripping with the milky fluid, soiling his father's best clothes also, poured out his petition of tears for sympathy and help, so the soul accustomed to leaning on the mighty arm of the Infinite rushes habitually to his bosom for pity and support, salvation and rest. The habit grows by practice. No sooner does he find himself fallen, than he calls to his merciful Father, confesses his inadvertency, pleads the merits of Jesus' blood, begs for pardon, and is restored. The time was when he would procrastinate this humble, penitent return to his resting-place after Satan's misleadings; but he has learned wisdom and improved his habits.

6. GROWTH IN THE ADMIRATION OF GOD'S CHARACTER.

God has created much that is lovely. But it is in no wise probable that he has ever created anything so lovely as himself. It is not probable that *all* the beauty and loveliness which he has created would, if summed up and concentrated in a resplendant focus, compare with the glorious loveliness of the ineffable Father of lights.

"Love sits in his eyelids
And scatters delight
Through all the bright mansions on high;
Their faces, the cherubim, vail in his sight,
And tremble with fullness of joy."

The heavens declare his glory; the firmament shows his skill; the earth proclaims his bounty; the seas re-echo the song; the cross declares his mercy; and angels the strains prolong. The birthday of the regenerate soul was a day of wondrous revelations in the realms of God's loveliness.

And yet "*eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.*" He has given a glimpse, a foretaste, "by his Spirit;" yet "*now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face.*"

As the soul grows in knowledge its apprehension of the loveliness of God's all-glorious character is extended and widened by the increasing apprehension of innumerable evidences of his loveliness. As the wonders of the deep expand before the vision of the sailing mariner, so do the wonders of Deity expand before the enraptured vision of the regenerate soul sailing in contemplation on the ocean of divinity. Thus its admiration of God increases, and probably will eternally, as it makes new discoveries of the obstruse wonders of the in-

finite parent mind, as revealed in his works, word, and providence.

7. GROWTH IN FIRMNESS is also an item in the process of growing in grace. As the soul proceeds in the acquisition of knowledge, growing in the habit of watchfulness and of prayer, growing in its admiration of the character of God, and as the field of privilege expands before its faith, its habit of trusting in God grows stronger, and it increases in stability and firmness. The probabilities of his backsliding are diminished, and those of his perseverance are increased. That is to say, Satan is less and less able to deceive and insnare him, and consequently his perseverance is more assured, while also his example is more nearly even. He is more reliable and trustworthy as a Christian. His habit of repudiating the wrong and "*approving the things that are excellent*," grows firmer. He becomes, in comparison with his infantile Christianity, like the oak of a century's growth in comparison with its infantile years—not so flexible, but more elastic and stronger.

8. GROWTH IN USEFULNESS is an inseparable consequence of the items of growth we have been considering. They make the man more efficient and more influential. Thus he becomes better prepared to win souls to Christ. This is the life-work of the Christian. Many church-members

seem to think they live only to be carried along by others to the land of repose. And they are often ready to complain of the roughness of the road and the hardness of the bed on which their patient friends are endeavoring to carry them. When they are once buried their neighbors will find no difficulty in forgetting the good works of their lives. The painful recollection of their petulancy will greatly assist in the efforts of any who may be inclined to forget their achievements for God and his kingdom. "*He that winneth souls is wise.*" "*Then* [*at the judgment-day*] *they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever.*" (Daniel.) One undoubted intention of the Infinite mind in the constitution of every moral being he has made, was, that it should reciprocate in usefulness with all others. "*Man lives to know, to produce, and to reciprocate.*" God is a perpetual benefactor to all other beings who have not, by their own disorderly acts, placed themselves beyond the reach of his benefits. Some, it is true, have played the maniac, and necessitated the pitying Father of all to shut them away from the family in the special asylum which he prepared specially for his child Lucifer, who fell crazy and commenced abusing the family. All who indorse his course and con-

tinue voluntarily, consciously, and persistently in his copartnership, will, of course, finally share with him in the possession of his special asylum. (See Matthew 25: 41.)

Besides these God is a perpetual benefactor to all; and all who are godly—godlike—have a disposition and a will to engage with him in "*doing good to all men.*" They consider the fact that all we can do in return for the innumerable and perpetual benefits we receive from his bountiful hand consists in these three items: 1. The love and praise of our hearts. 2. The praise of our lips. 3. Efforts to induce others to love and praise him. They rejoice that he says, "*Whoso offereth praise, glorifieth me.*" (Psalms.) It all merges into the one item—honor. We can honor him in our hearts with love. We can honor him with our lips, in utterance of praise to his name, and persuasions to induce others to love and praise him. We can honor him with our substance, employing it to bring about the enlightenment and persuasion of others to love and praise him.

The child of God loves his Father; and this moves him to labor for the promotion of his kingdom and glory. This brings him into vigorous action for the salvation of his fellow-men; for no one can love God without loving his fellow-men. God commands it, and his child obeys. God not

only commands it, but to those who resolve on obedience and membership in his family, he gives the ability to obey,—or rather the *state of obedience*, —by filling their hearts with his person and nature, which is *love*. They love spontaneously God and their fellow-men. Now they are moved by his indwelling presence to "*work out*" what he works in them. They can only cease working externally for his glory in the salvation of men by resisting his inward promptings; "*for it is God that worketh in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure.*" He never forces the will contrary to itself, but seeks to persuade it. When it moves in harmony with his persuasions or "workings," it invariably "labors with him" for the salvation of men. "*The love of Christ constraineth us.*" When love reigns, love constrains. When love can not constrain to acts of love, then love no longer reigns, but Satan. Then the hands, time, talent, and means will be employed solely in the work of self-gratification. Moral death is now the condition of the soul. Yet it may drag along in religious forms and professions. Dragging the soul through lifeless forms of religion is a favorite work with Satan. It deceives effectually.

He who attends to his own highest interests seeks the glory of God and the salvation of his fellow-men; for God has ordained that our own

highest glory is inseparably connected with his glory and the good of our fellows. No power on earth, in heaven, or in hell, can ever break this eternal decree. Each one can sever his connection with this triune firm whose factors are, 1. God; 2. I; 3. My neighbor. But none can disannul the eternal decree, that "TRUE WISDOM, MORAL PURITY, AND ETERNAL BLISS ARE FOUND ONLY IN THIS TRIUNE FIRM."

Some men do little or nothing to save their fellow-man (because they have not the love of Christ to constrain them), and wonder why their formal

religious performances give them no sweet peace at present, nor assurance of bliss in the future. It is a problem of easy solution. Those who are working themselves to death to save souls, are continually happy. So hath God decreed. "Love to God supremely, and love to man subordinately." (Thomas Dick.)

9. GROWTH IN THE HABIT OF RESTRAINING THE PHYSICAL APPETITES AND GOVERNING THEM ACCORDING TO GOD'S WORD AND ENLIGHTENED REASON, is a very important item of growth in grace. "*Be not effeminate.*" Add to your *faith*, your *virtue*, and your *knowledge*, the item of "*temperance.*" Ungoverned appetites will soon enslave their possessor and lay him in the jaws of the destroyer. If sensuality caused the eternal ruin of the once wise and renowned King Solomon, ordinary men will stand a poor chance for escape from the slimy clutches of the voluptuous old Bacchus, if once he has gained a thorough gripe on them. The only safe way is in total abstinence from all unnecessary gratification of the physical appetites, and a rigid restraint within proper and healthful rules of *temperance* in the *necessary* gratifications.

Some men eat and drink to live, labor, win souls to Christ and honor God; while others live to eat and drink and laugh and grow fat in self-gratification. "*Their eyes stand out with fatness.*"

"*Their God is their belly.*" "*They that will be rich, fall into temptation, and a snare, and many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.*" (Paul.)

"*But God said to him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; * * so is every one that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.* (Jesus.) He who undertakes to run a firm by himself, for his own gratification, in the pursuit and enjoyment of riches, honors, or pleasures, will find himself at last a *fool*, and smite himself for having undertaken to set aside the eternal decree of the Almighty, which forever precludes the possibility of true bliss to the soul which is not in the love of God. "*Delight thyself in the Lord; and he shall give thee the desire of thine heart.*" All hearts desire happiness. God made us so, and provided for our gratification, but not apart from himself—not on an independent line. He proposes to give the bliss and take the glory. This is right; and he will never vary from right. A constant recognition of and practice according to this rule will insure strength, usefulness, and bliss in time and in eternity.

10. GROWTH IN AMIABILITY — GRACEFULNESS — will be an effect of growth in the several particulars we have now noticed. He who grows in the items mentioned will surely become a more lovely

and beloved Christian. The pure in heart are not all alike amiable and graceful, as they are not all alike talented and useful. Jesus loved all his disciples, and yet one was called "*the disciple whom Jesus loved.*" Enoch and Elijah were favored with a deathless transit to their heavenly home. Paul was honored with a view of the heavenly paradise, the home of the Christian, the land of rest and glories untold. John, on the lonely isle, had the honor of sketching many heavenly scenes.

Through him God announced the premium on faithful endurance—a resurrection of the martyrs one thousand years before the general resurrection. (See Rev. 20: 4.)

By self-denial and close application the pure in heart become wiser, stronger, more graceful and useful, and consequently better fitted for important places of trust in the kingdom of God. By long self-denial, a constant walk with God, and a careful study of his character, his ways, and the things pertaining to his kingdom, Enoch stood long as a bright, burning light in a dark world, and became ripe for the honor of a deathless transit to the land of light. The same is true of Elijah. Noah, Abraham, Moses, Daniel, John, Paul, and the other martyrs reached high honors by similar means. "*Go ye also into the vineyard;*

AND WHATSOEVER IS RIGHT, *that shall ye receive.*" (Matt. 20: 7.)

So says the Proprietor of the vineyard. When it is right to feed you by ravens, to send fire and consume your offering in presence of your enemies, or to give you a transit to the land beyond the clouds in a chariot of fire; when it is right to send an angel to shut the lions' mouths in the den where enemies have thrown you, or to suspend the laws of combustion in the heated furnace, when it is right to shake the stocks from your limbs and open the prison doors; when it is right to give you a vision of the tree, the fruit, the river, the sea of glass, and the harpers in the paradise of heaven; when it is right to "chasten by scourging," when it is right to "*make your enemies to be at peace with you*," or to let them loose on you for a season; when it is right to send the eternal Spirit and break the hearts of sinners in answer to your prayer,—seeing it comes from a humble, bleeding heart, and a soul that labors in self-denial for the glory of God,—and thus prepare sheaves for your gathering in the great harvest-day, and stars for your crown of glory; "*whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive.*" If it be right to record by your name on the roll of God's nobility, "Ten souls won to the love of God through self-denying labors and sacrifices," or if it be right to

record "fifty," or "one hundred," or "one thousand," or "ten thousand," "*whatsoever is right*," shall the angel record. And there shall the record stand for eternal inspection by the glorified millions. "*They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever.*"

CONCLUDING CHAPTER.

WORDS OF ADVICE TO YOUNG CHRISTIANS.

Here we should have a 29th OBJECTION,—ON THE PERVERSION OF BIBLE TERMS. But our limits will not permit. Some good hand will at no distant day elaborate on the perversion of Bible terms caused by the double-birth doctrine in the use of the expressions, "Full salvation; entire sanctification; complete holiness; fully saved," &c. The Bible tells us about salvation, great salvation, eternal salvation, but never a word about half salvation, partial salvation, nor full salvation. It speaks of sanctification, but never of half, or partial, or entire sanctification. It speaks of holiness, but never of partial, imperfect, incomplete, complete, entire, or perfect holiness. It speaks of men being saved, but never of their being half, partially, or entirely saved. Simply saved. Saved, in Bible style, means saved. No one can be said to be saved when he is partially saved half washed, or partly sanctified. The word al-

ways speaks of God's work as a thing complete. "Whoso putteth his trust [not half trust] in the Lord shall be safe." Not half safe, but simply safe. We should not talk about "full salvation," as if there were a half salvation, but SALVATION.

I. KEEP ALL ON THE ALTAR.

1. You became a Christian by a full and complete consecration of yourself, and consequently of all you possessed, to God. No man ever became a Christian any other way. As we have repeatedly noticed, it is not denied by the "second-work" theologians that a man must make a full surrender and consecration of himself to God in order to obtain pardon, though they hold that a man may consecrate himself without consecrating all his possessions. This is a grave blunder. A man's self is the most valuable possession he has. Nay, it is more so to him than all else. If you could own your neighbor, you would own whatever is called his. So then it is obvious that a man can not consecrate himself to God without at the same time consecrating all his possessions.

Then God is recognized—as he in reality always is—the proprietor of all, and the soul enters his firm as a factor.

2. Yet it is not probable that you enumerated all the items in your wholesale consecration. Your mind or heart was precisely in the same state, how-

ever, as if you had reckoned every item, and God so accepted it; for "*the Lord looketh on the heart.*" And he says, "Ye shall find me when ye shall search for me with all your heart." (Part will not do.)

3. In the same manner "*as you have received the Lord Jesus, so walk in him.*" Satan will tempt you to take back some of the items included in your unreserved consecration. The least yielding in such a case will separate your heart from God. Then God will be out.

If Satan succeeds in the least item it will be by inducing in your heart a love for the item withdrawn from the altar. This will be love of the world, and so an act of disobedience to the holy command which says, "*Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.*" (I. John 2: 15.) Loving the world does not necessarily include the attachment of the heart to every individual thing in the world, any more than the consecration of a farm to God supposes the specific enumeration of every tree, shrub, rail, stone, quadruped, and fowl on its surface, and every piece of oar and stone beneath. Whenever the affection is set on a solitary item of worldly matter or possession,—riches, honors, and pleasures include all,—then the love of the world is in

the heart, and "*the love of the Father is not in.*" This is just what has morally killed millions of church-members, whom Satan is dragging in his net like so many insnared fishes, to the burning shore of eternal perdition.

This taking back items from the altar and appropriating them to their own exclusive use, is preparing multitudes for a "second work," or "the second death."

Keep all on the altar of your God. Watch away the birds as Abraham did (Gen. 15: 11); or the old, black bird of Gehenna will carry away the sacrifice, and with it your soul.

II. Guard well the heart against the love of the world; that is, riches, honors, and pleasures.

1. If you owned the globe you could have riches, honors, and pleasures, and no more. "The love of money [which represents all earthly possessions] is the root of all evil." This kind of love is a root which will grow any or all other evils, if permitted to grow. Money is a necessity; but the love of it is the root of all evil. It is a soul-condition which is the opposite of the love of God. It is idolatry, which God hates.

Yet it is a root that grows very rapidly in the heart, and entirely unperceived by those who are not watchful and prayerful. As the insignificant thorn, a mere twig which could easily be removed

by the thumb and finger from your rich garden-bed, silently thrusts its roots deep into the earth, and rapidly becomes a well-established tree, requiring a stout team for its removal, so the silent roots of worldly love thrust themselves deeply and rapidly unperceived into the fertile soil of the heart, and will cost bitter tears, and require the power of Omnipotence to remove them. If left to grow they will ruin the soul in endless night.

2. Satan can lead the soul astray only by means of desire. Hence James says, "*Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.*" (Jas. 1:14.) Only by the enticements of riches, honors, or pleasures, enforced by the deceptive powers of the great deceiver, applied in one way or another, can the soul be led away from Christ and moral purity. So it occurred in Eden. So it occurs to-day. Satan induced the first transgression in our race by deceptive enticement. "*Ye shall not surely die,*" was the *first falsehood* uttered on our planet. It deceived our parents, and in connection with the impression which was made on the eye by the forbidden object, together with the true statement that God knew they would make a new discovery in the first moment of guilt,—a discovery of the contrast between good and evil, innocence and guilt, purity and corruption,—it led them into sin and moral death—the

loss of the life of God from the soul—the moral night from which none can prove they ever emerged.

3. "*The deceitfulness of riches*" can only be transcended by the deceitfulness of the father of falsehood. The heart can never be too well nor too constantly guarded against it. The answer to the question, "Will I be saved?" will be given when the answer to the question, "Will I love God instead of the world?" is given. "*How hardly shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of heaven.*"

4. Do not trust in any earthly thing. Sure as the heart trusts in any object for safety or bliss, so sure will it love that object; for "*where the treasure is, there will the heart be also.*" Truer philosophy never was uttered. A man's treasure is anything he trusts in for safety or happiness. We can not avoid loving our treasure.

5. Our only safety lies in perpetual, unreserved trust in God. To induce this in all moral beings is the central design of Deity throughout the realms of nature and revelation. Do so, and live eternally in bliss ineffable.

III. SEEK PERPETUAL DELIGHTS FROM GOD.

1. This will keep the heart from the love of the world. God made the soul for pleasures, and pleasures for the soul. "*Thou wilt make them to* drink of the river of thy pleasures." (Psalms.)

"*Delight thyself in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart.*" (Ps. 37.) "*Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.*" "*Rejoice in the Lord evermore; and again, I say, Rejoice.*" (Paul.) "*The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace,*" &c. Whatever is a fruit of the Spirit is surely a part of the Christian religion. Some tell us that FEELING is no part of the Christian religion; but the quotations above show the fallacy of such statements. Joy is a fruit of the Spirit; and joy consists wholly in emotions of pleasure. Joy is nothing but feeling.

2. Let the Spirit continually bring joy to thy heart, 1. by his direct flashes of quickening, thrilling, invigorating power; 2. by leading thy soul in sweet meditations on his work, his word, his providence, his "great salvation," thy happy home in heaven; 3. by quickening thy thoughts, thy memory, thy judgment, thy reasoning powers, while engaged in laboring for his glory in the salvation of souls. Never allow a day to pass and the slumbers of night to close in upon thee without the Spirit's sweet tokens of love. Thy soul needs it. Thy God designed it, and wills it, and will bestow it when thy soul assumes the required attitude before him. In any other attitude it is in danger of eternal ruin. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." Therefore,

when he possesses and reigns in the soul, light and joy reign there. When, therefore, thy soul is in darkness and gloom, know assuredly thou art not justified before God, not being in the proper attitude for him to reign in thy heart. Thy gloom has arisen from want of trustfulness in the hand of thy God. And "he that believeth not is condemned already." Distrust dishonors God, and therefore brings his disapprobation, his condemnation.

3. Make no arrangement nor room for "dark seasons." Rule them out entirely. Give no heed to the counsels of those stupid, unspiritual teachers who tell you, "We must, or at least will have our dark seasons." If you decide that the dark seasons must be endured, it will throw your mind—perhaps unconsciously—into such a doubtful attitude that you will drive God out, and so actually bring the thing which your stupid prophet predicted, just as the lady committed suicide because a lying fortune-teller predicted for her that she would do so. This is not a fictitious statement.

When clouds come flitting over your spiritual sky, just frankly tell your God that by your unwatchfulness you have thrown yourself into a wrong attitude of soul, in which you have no right to be, and ask him just now to help you out; and do not cease the struggle till his sunlight beams

sweetly into your soul. Depend on it, this is his will. Hear once more the voice of his prophet on this point; hear and believe: "*Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.*" (Isa. 26: 3.) Mark carefully, "*Because he trusteth in thee.*" Here is God's because for special help to the soul. Not riches, honors, pleasures, learning, position, ancestry, nor religious forms or ceremonies; but the soul's act and attitude of trust in God brings God into the soul with his "*kingdom of righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.*" (Rom. 14: 17.) Here we see indisputably that an essential element of the kingdom of God in the soul on earth, as well as in heaven above, is JOY.

4. And we do well, for our own safety and usefulness, to remember and never forget that the joy is not the joy of mirth, frivolity, voluptuousness, or gayety. It is not such joy as the people had in the days of calf-worship, when "they sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play." It is not the joy of the theater, the dance, or the play. It is "*joy in the Holy Ghost.*" It is "*the peace of God which passeth all understanding.*" It is the same kind of joy that fills the bosom of the infinite Father. "*These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.*"

5. Many who profess to be the children of God run after the things in which the wicked find their joy. This greatly dishonors God. It says to the unconverted, "There is not a sufficiency of joy in the religion of Jesus Christ; therefore I come to the fountains from which the wicked drink." This is a great, dark slander on Jesus. It says his salvation is defective. This is not true. These representatives misrepresent. Therefore they are not representatives. They are slanderers of Jesus. Their course says Jesus lies when he says, "Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." (John 16: 24.) Of course, they implicate his servant John in the same crime; for he said, "*These things write we unto you, that your joy might be full.*" (I. John 1: 4.) And John recriminates them, saying, "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all *If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth.*" (I. John 1: 5, 6.) Thus there is a fearful war between those professors of godliness who, by word or action, teach that the Christian system is defective in the item of joy, and Jesus and his inspired writers. Satan never takes sides with Jesus. He is on their side; therefore they are on his side, and working for and with him. This is clearly manifested by the fact that they take pleasure in the same things that give pleas-

ure to Satan's most devoted children. This shows that they have the same kind of taste. They are therefore of the same spirit. It is easy to "*try the spirits.*" When we see men delighting in the same things which give pleasure to the soul of the rebel against God, we must conclude that the two souls have the same moral taste, and are therefore in the same moral condition. It can not be otherwise. It is a matter of the utmost importance to know what manner of spirit we are of. And it is easy to do so with God's word in our hand and honesty in our heart. Some religionists give full indorsement to the Bible idea that it is God's plan that Christians should be joyful. "Oh, yes," they say, "Christians should be joyful;" and away they go into the scenes, associations, and appliances to which the wicked resort for joy. The wicked sometimes hire these blind guides to assist in the indorsement of things too tough for their own hard consciences. They pay well to have such items christened. Precious soul, let thy joy ever be that which constitutes an essential element of the kingdom of God—the "*joy of the Holy Ghost.*"

6. Be exceedingly careful never to seek joy as an *end*—merely to have pleasure. Seek perpetually as your highest aim to glorify God. Collateral with this aim let your aim be to keep a

pure heart. "*The wisdom that cometh from above is first pure.*" Seek as the only means of purity the indwelling Holy Spirit. When he dwells within your joy is secure. Take its absence as an evidence of the absence of the Spirit, and its presence as an evidence of his presence. But never set up a standard for the Spirit to work by in the degree of your joys, either high or low. Here Satan may deceive you, and run you into selfishness. Let this be your standard, "*His delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night. * * Whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.*" (Ps. 1.) Whenever the Spirit enables you to take delight in every item and feature of God's law you are safe, and may praise him as your Savior. Resting thus, with a heart full of praises, and lips willing to utter them aloud, you may leave the higher ecstacies to his sovereign pleasure, being careful not to quench them and him by proud silence when he prompts you to declare his presence, his love, his peace, his joy, and his glory.

IV. Constantly regard God as a present, personal associate.

1. Science, as well as revelation, declares that "*in God we live and move and have our being.*"

2. But the sinner's guilt makes God's presence disagreeable to his conscience. Therefore his imagination struggles continually to place God at a vast distance, and to make him oblivious to the soul's moral condition. Thus he ostracises the lovely One who made, sustains, environs, and continually yearns over him with pity. They have no fellowship, though continually in the closest proximity.

3. THE HIGHEST PRIVILEGE EVER ENJOYED BY A CREATURE IS PERSONAL FELLOWSHIP, PERSONAL ASSOCIATION WITH GOD.

4. This inexpressibly glorious privilege is constantly enjoyed by the Christian. When he ceases to enjoy it, he ceases to be a Christian. "*God is light. * * If we walk in the light, * * we have fellowship one with another.*" If we are not in him we are not Christians. If we are in him we have fellowship with him. "*Abide in me, and I in you.*" "*I will come in to him and sup with him, and he with me.*" We will feast together. This is intimate and exalting association for the soul.

5. There is no safety except in the most familiar (not frivolous) and intimate association with God. The soul must and will find society in something. Whatever it chooses for the gratification of its social nature will have a high place in its affections. If it be not God, it will be some

other object. Then the heart will be in the idolatrous state.

6. Converse with God as an intimate, affectionate, all-sufficient friend, close by your side; yea, within your breast, and not away beyond the farthest planet.

"Speak to him, thou; for he hears;
And spirit with spirit may meet.
Closer is he than breathing,
And near than hands and feet."

"*He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye.*"

Let him be thy associate and partner in 1. pleasures; 2. in pain; 3. in toil; 4. in care; 5. in possessions; 6. in honors; 7. in reproaches; 8. in conversation. Walk with him as Enoch did; and he declares, "*I will dwell in them, and walk in them.*"

V. "BRING INTO CAPTIVITY EVERY THOUGHT TO THE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST." (II. Cor. 10: 5.)

1. "*For the Lord understandeth even the imaginations of the thoughts.*"

2. Thought is the root of all action. Thought originated and sustains the universe. The character of a man's thoughts decides the character of the man. "*As a man thinketh, so is he.*" Moral qualities do not reside in physical substances nor

in mechanical actions, but in thought, which originated physical substance, and in soul, which produces mechanical action.

3. Therefore the regulation of our thoughts according to God's word is a matter of the first importance. It is absolutely essential to Christian character. "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: *all these evil things come from within, and defile the man.*" (Mark 7: 21–23.)

4. The thoughts which are induced by an unavoidable sight or sound, thrust suddenly upon our attention, do not necessarily produce guilt. But so soon as a wrong thought is indulged in the way of desire, or affection, or temper, going out after forbidden objects, it becomes sin, and not only brings guilt, but also corruption. It is the soul's act of sowing to the flesh; and a crop of corruption is inevitable. "*Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.*" (Gal. 6: 7, 8.) God has established a law in the constitution of the moral being that every improper act of the soul produces corruption,—self-

corruption,—a polluted state. A contrary soul-action, reaching out after God, in his specified way, by the blood of Christ, insures his speedy help in the impartation of "*life everlasting.*"

5. "*Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.*" But remember, thou canst keep it only by trusting it over into the personal hand of God. "*Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.*" (Isa. 26: 3.) When thou findest thy thoughts beyond thy control thou hast, by carelessness, left them—thy mind—in Satan's hand. Be alarmed, plead guilty, reach vehemently after God, call earnestly for help, and do nothing else till he comes. "*Tarry till thou be endued with power.*" Do not tell God to hurry up, so that you may go on about something else more agreeably with your feelings; yet pray him to hasten to your rescue, for Jesus' sake. And with this plea on your tongue, panting for the living God as the hart panteth for the water-brook, wait on the Lord till he please to come and renew thy strength. Do not undertake alone to rid thy soul of the least wrong thought, passion, affection, or desire, but in God's strength struggle against the least or the greatest till it be thrust entirely from thy heart. Then cling to and commune with your deliverer for the pleasure of it, and employ your strength of soul

and body not in play, but in ceaseless study and labor for his glory. Whenever labor and sacrifice for him are not pleasurable, thy soul is in a wrong condition. Whenever thou art shy about communing with him, it is the same. Plead guilty, ask for mercy, "*delight thyself in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart;*" that is, pleasure. (See Ps. 37: 4.)

6. Never undertake to explain your thoughts, feelings, affections, or motives to God—for you never on earth or in heaven will be able to understand yourself as well as God does; but assume that he sees the whole situation and condition of your soul in every *minutia*, and ask him to heal and straighten whatever is lame and crooked, and to wash away its defilement, just as a child calls for help from that parent who sees it fall into the slough and soil its snow-white garments. "*If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*"

VI. "Have always a conscience void of offense toward God and toward men." (Acts 24: 16.)

1. Conscience is that power of the soul by which it approves itself for having done or purposed what the judgment declares to be right, and by which it condemns itself for having done or

purposed what the judgment declares to be wrong.

2. When our choices or decisions are in favor of what our judgment condemns, we violate conscience, commit an offense against it; and it will ever after accuse us for the offense till the wrong be corrected and the soul-stain be washed away.

3. The Bible is the only proper guide to our judgment in moral qualities. This is because it is God's book; and conscience always recognizes a God and a retribution. Hence arise the fearful ravings and loud accusations of conscience in the guilty soul under the apprehension of a speedy meeting with God.

When young H., in Williams County, Ohio, was thrown into the air, in expectation of sudden death before he reached the ground the deeds of his whole life rushed in review before his guilty soul.

When a young profligate, fallen from fine circumstances, was in a fit of *delirium tremens*, in Henry County, Ohio, there seemed to him to be three stout men close at hand seeking his life, and a fourth standing quietly by his side, constantly repeating the accusation, "You knew better than to do as you did; you knew better than to drink; you knew it would hurt you; you knew it was wrong; you knew better," &c. Whether in heaven,

in hell, or in empty space beyond the limits of creation, this man's conscience will accuse him eternally, unless the stains of sin be washed away by the blood of the Lamb. Without this only remedy, "*the dreary regions of remorse*" must be his eternal abode, whatever name may be given to his locality. O land of remorse! Dreary waste of moral darkness! Desert land of the scorpion sting! Saharah of wrecked souls! State of tremendous terrors! Garden of the blasted rose! State of eternal suicide! Light eternal, shine on our pathway, and save us from the fearful doom.

4. Never do an act of doubtful propriety. "*He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*" Whatever act is done without the full faith that it is right involves the soul's consent to wrong. Every rational soul knows it has no right to give the slightest indorsement to wrong. Therefore it can never approve itself in the attitude of such indorsement. Hence it can never rest in the sweet peace of self-approbation after having decided in favor of anything without being fully convinced that it is right, until the guilt be washed away by the blood of the Lamb. Nor can it enjoy the approving smiles of God; for "*if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.*" He who constituted our soul with the

element of conscience in it has a higher authority and a keener perception than our conscience. He is not prejudiced for nor against us, as we are liable to be. If, then, with our self-love—not to say partiality—we condemn ourselves, it is surely on account of something in us which justice can not approve, and which must therefore meet the condemnation of a just God. Therefore, there is no peace to the unholy, in time or eternity, whether they are located in earth, heaven, hell, or the trackless void beyond the universe. "*No peace, saith God, to the wicked.*" (Isa. 57 : 21.)

5. Conscience is not a "creature of education;" for education never created it. But it is subject to the guidance of education, though God is its creator, as he is the creator of the soul in which it coinheres and the body in which both reside. The soul is to a great extent its own educator with the appliances at hand, as it is always at liberty to make its own selection of ideas and judge for itself of their consistency and the harmony of principles.

6. The soul may become so enamored with the god of this world, and blinded by false doctrine, that conscience ceases for the time being to smite the soul, even in great crimes. This point is reached by gradual processes of wrong indulgences. The soul first slowly, gradually slides into self-

approval in slight self-indulgences. "One compliance prepares it for another." After a length of time in increasing indulgence "*they have their conscience seared with a hot iron*" (I. Tim. 4: 2), and are prepared to blend religious forms and professions and God's holy word with frivolity, levity, and even with lasciviousness and blasphemy. Satan is always a very helpful, interested party in all such processes.

7. Honest, careful study of God's word, a fixed purpose always to do right and never wrong, constant self-denial pursuant to this purpose, and constant trust in God, will secure a "conscience void of offense toward God and men." But there is no other way to secure this greatest of treasures.

8. Mistakes are possible with all finite beings; but crime and guilt are impossible to the soul that has a fixed purpose to do right, right only, right continually, and "the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost given unto it." (See Rom. 5: 5.) "He can not sin because he is born of God." (I. John 3: 9.) He trusts in God. God bears him above Satan and sin. In this condition he can not sin, though he may make mistakes, and even do things which will blunt and stupefy his soul-powers, his moral sensibilities, becloud his moral vision, lead him after a time into doubtings,

slacken his fervor in God's service, and so loose his hold on the only Rock of safety. Then he inevitably falls. Now he may cry to God in bitter tears, and be lifted out of the pit again. But he can not again consciously take the same dangerous path without incurring guilt at the first step; for the soul can not for one moment innocently pursue a path in which there appears the least evidence of danger to its purity.

God and conscience always agree in the monitory command, "*Abstain from all appearance of evil.*" Hence every step in the path where the soul sees evidence of danger to its perfect purity is a crime. The great destroyer has ruined millions with the Morphean phrase, "NOT MUCH HARM," and is ruining millions more. "NOT MUCH HARM" is often his last sugar-coated pill of deadly poison. Take it, unwary soul, and die, or reject it and live; but never hope to take it and the joy of the Holy Ghost together. It can never be done.

VII. "PRAY WITHOUT CEASING." (I. Thess. 5: 13.)

I. *God is acquainted with all.*

1. Our thoughts. 2. Our feelings. 3. Our desires. 4. Our wishes. 5. Our motives. 6. Our affections. 7. Our intentions. 8. Our volitions.

9. Our imaginings. 10. Our reasonings. 11. Our joys. 12. Our sorrows.

II. *God knows all our needs.*

1. Our physical needs—food drink, clothing, light, heat, air, &c. 2. Our intellectual needs—perception, imagination, reasoning power, judgment, &c. 3. Our moral and spiritual needs—purity, sensibility, power, love, joy, peace, patience, tender-heartedness, hope, courage, &c.

III. *God is good.*

1. Godness is an element in his nature; he is essentially good. He is therefore disposed to do good to all his creatures so long as it is right to do so.

2. He delights in the happiness of all his creatures; and, being perfectly independent and proprietor of all things, and therefore never in need of favors from any other being, he can never be bribed to do wrong.

3. We are his children, and hold him by the tie of parental affection. "*Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.*" (Ps. 103: 13.)

4. He loves to be loved and honored and praised, and therefore delights in doing us good,

to inspire in us gratitude, love, and praise to him. Thus our interests interlock with his. He manifests his loveliness to inspire love, gratitude, and praise. "He inhabits praises." (Ps. 22: 3.)

5. He has promised, on certain conditions, to supply all our needs.

IV. All these considerations constitute an ample foundation for the faith that, on compliance with the stipulated conditions, he will fully supply all our needs.

V. Why should we pray?

The question naturally arises, Why should we pray if God is infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness?

We should pray to honor God. The highest motive that can ever actuate any created being in any world is perpetually required of us. "*Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsover ye do, do all to the glory of God.*" (I. Cor. 10; 31.)

1. When we pray we honor God by an act of obedience. He commands it. All disobedience dishonors God by the attitude of defiant independence.

2. Prayer honors God by an expressed acknowledgment of our dependence upon him.

3. It honors God by expressing confidence in

him. This inspires confidence toward him in the minds of those who hear us pray. For this reason all parents should often pray in the hearing of their children. The prayer-meeting is a powerful war against infidelity.

4. We should pray for the same reason that we breathe—to live. We breathe to live temporally. And as the branch can not draw nourishishment and life from the vine without a continued unifying contact and connection with the parent vine, nor the body continue in life without continued contact with and invigoration from the atmosphere, so the soul can not continue in the holy life without continual unifying contact and connection with God. The connection of the branch with the vine and the motion of the lungs in breathing are instinctive and involuntary; but the soul's connection with God can only be voluntary. Yet the habit of the soul in its constant clinging to and communing with God may become so strong that its out-reachings after him frequently proceed when the intellect is partially or almost wholly occupied with something else. Every soul should acquire this heavenly habit. No other is so safe and healthy for the soul. We should speak to God whenever we think of it. Oh, wondrous privilege! We commune with Him who sits enthroned among the myriads of lofty

intelligences, whose movements in obedience to his will are like the lightning's flash (Ez. 1: 14), more intimately than it is possible to commune with our dearest earthly friend. It is madness not to avail ourselves of this astounding privilege, purchased for us by the blood of the Lamb, and bestowed by the Holy One.

VI. WHY HAS GOD REQUIRED US TO PRAY, seeing he knows our needs before we ask him?

1. To keep us in memory of our dependence on him. The most destructive of all feelings is that of independence. 1. It is false. 2. It severs the soul from God. 3. It slanders God by assuming that he is insufficient, by contradicting his word—calls him a liar,—and by repudiating his government—calls him a usurper. 4. It spurns his benevolence and ridicules his bountiful provision for our wants. 5. It defies his power and authority. There is no feeling more welcome to the unregenerate heart; none more pleasing to Satan. None other is so hateful to God. None but God is independent; therefore none other has a right to feel so. By his command, "*Pray without ceasing*," he reminds us of our perpetual need of his help. Nothing is more important for us to remember.

2. Prayer reminds us of our accountability to God. It does this by bringing the soul, as it were,

face to face with him. While speaking to him we can not avoid the recollection that he knows our hearts, our moral condition, our secret thoughts, and that "*God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.*" (Eccl. 12: 14.) This keeps our thoughts from wandering "like the eyes of the fool to the ends of the earth." It keeps the whole man, soul and body, thoughts and tongue, from running into mischief. The soul can not reach after God and wickedness at the same time any more than the lungs can breathe pure and foul atmosphere at the same time.

Pray, therefore, perpetually, breathing, as it were, the Holy Spirit, for the preservation of thy soul from moral death and the ruinous contagion around thee in this sinful world. When thy soul reaches after God it becomes consistent and right for him to do for thee what he could not otherwise do. Thou canst never turn Deity from his plans and purposes by praying. But, remember, it is his plan and purpose to save the soul only when it reaches after him and commits its entire being into his hand. This is true prayer.

VII. Pray in Jesus' name.

Neither prayer nor praise can be acceptably offered except through Jesus' name; that is, through

the atonement made by him. "*Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.*" (Col. 3: 17.) We should begin, proceed, and end all our works in the name of our holy Redeemer. Let him be all and in all. "*To him be glory and dominion forever and ever.*"

AMEN.

BT
766

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: August 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 014 650 187 4